

MID-AMERICA

An Historical Review

VOLUME 33, NUMBER 3

JULY 1951

MID-AMERICA

An Historical Review

JULY 1951

VOLUME 33

NEW SERIES, VOLUME 22

NUMBER 3

CONTENTS

TRADE INTERESTS OF XVIII CENTURY

BRITISH TRAVEL WRITERS *Herman J. Muller* 139

THE RELIGION OF BOLIVAR *Jerome V. Jacobsen* 158

BOOK REVIEWS 188

NOTES AND COMMENTS 195

MANAGING EDITOR

JEROME V. JACOBSEN, *Chicago*

EDITORIAL STAFF

WILLIAM STETSON MERRILL
J. MANUEL ESPINOSA
W. EUGENE SHIELS

RAPHAEL HAMILTON
PAUL KINIERY
PAUL S. LIETZ

Published quarterly by Loyola University (The Institute of Jesuit History) at 50 cents a copy. Annual subscription, \$2.00; in foreign countries, \$2.50. Publication and editorial offices at Loyola University, 6525 Sheridan Road, Chicago 26, Illinois. All communications should be addressed to the Managing Editor. Entered as second class matter, August 7, 1929, at the post office at Chicago, Illinois, under the Act of March 3, 1879. Additional entry as second class matter at the post office at Effingham, Illinois. Printed in the United States.

MID-AMERICA

An Historical Review

JULY 1951

VOLUME 33

NEW SERIES, VOLUME 22

NUMBER 3

Trade Interests of XVIII Century British Travel Writers

The voyages of Portuguese and Spanish ships during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries resulted in the opening of the seas of the world to venturesome Europeans and in world-wide discoveries of new lands and strange peoples. The data about each newly found coast or island gathered by pilot after pilot was used by cartographers to fill in the open spaces on their world charts. In time letters of travellers, journals of explorers, accounts of merchants, government agents, and missionaries who had journeyed abroad began to be culled for more detailed information which might add value to the maps in process of composition and make obsolete those drafted shortly before.

After the exploits of Magellan by sea and Cortés by land filtered down to the people the enthusiasm for the New World grew by leaps and bounds. Voyageurs of whatever sort began to vie with one another in relating experiences, actual or fancied, gained in the Indies. The courts rejoiced in the ever expanding glories of their overseas empires. Merchants of Spain and Portugal quickened the envy of their continental rivals. Your cartographers in Spain, as those of earlier years in Portugal, were happy to place on their charts many highly glamerous placenames—La Florida, El Dorado, Castillo del Oro, Cibola, Mar del Sur, Portobelo, Puerto Rico, Amazonas, California, Potosí, Zacatecas, Rio de la Plata. Incoming ships brought news of the latest wonders along with samples of the wealth of the Americans. All news further whetted the appetites of envious foreigners. Agents, spies and thieves busied themselves about obtaining maps or copies of maps, relations of voyages, or letters from the Americas, all of which were

in demand in Europe. Pirates, privateers and other navigators of Holland, France and the British Isles came to know the West Indies and the American coasts very well. People of the ports of England, welcoming the tales of returning seamen, caught the spirit of adventure and felt the lure of exploration for personal gain or glory.

Clearing the Oxford examinations in 1577, Richard Hakluyt, then twenty-four years old, raised from infancy in a tradition of map study, presented the first public lectures in England on geography. His first scholarly task was to bring the maps of the world abreast of the time for the British. His work of coordinating previous knowledge of the world was of course a godsend to navigators and potential navigators. Not only were they inspired with confidence by the most accurate information extant, but the public became inspired to back merchantmen (to say nothing of pirates) outward bound for foreign commodities. The quicker returns from piratical expeditions had much to do with hampering the development of a normal trade in England during the seventeenth century.

Hakluyt's next step toward making the British geographically-minded proved to be a powerful stimulant toward making them discovery-conscious. From 1582 he published eyewitness accounts of famous voyages of discovery, beginning with *Divers Voyages touching the Discoveries of America*. The complete pattern of his inspiring publications appeared in 1589.¹ Throughout the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries he was followed by a long list of writers most of whom sought to instill in their readers both pride in the exploits of their countrymen on the high seas and encouragement to do like deeds. Foreign accounts and books were gathered, translated and published sometimes individually, sometimes as parts of larger collections.

How popular the new travel literature had remained in eighteenth century England is amply brought out by contemporaries. A good instance of the issue at point was the Reverend Mr. Barclay. One almost smiles to hear this learned gentleman explain how the "small encouragement now given, for publishing books upon any divine subject," has hindered him from prosecuting his "design of publishing a second *Letter to the people in Scotland*, endeavoring to remove their prejudices to the Book of Common Prayer."² The

¹ Richard Hakluyt, *The Principall Navigations, Voyages and Discoveries of the English Nation*, London, 1589.

² Patrick Barclay, *The Universal Traveller*, London, 1735, Preface.

Reverend Mr. Barclay seems to have had little trouble in finding a publisher for his *Universal Traveller*, a type of literature more agreeable to the devotees of present enjoyment, or to those avid for financially profitable voyages to far lands. Another divine, the Reverend John Harris, mentions "the peculiar Pleasure and improvement that Books of Voyages and Travels afford" as the reason why "they are as much, if not more read than any one Branch of polite Literature."³

For further indication of a growing vogue of travel-literature one might consult a handy reference guide to the literature of the period. The great number of printed volumes on geography and travel found there gives witness to their popularity. Significantly too many of these works went into two or more editions. After all, publishers of bygone centuries were no less zealous in their quest for "best sellers" than those of the present day.

For the most part, writers and publishers of books on geography and travel seem to have aimed at a rather broad reading public. John Stevens, for example, in his *Peter de Cieza*, felt that people needed not to be convinced of the utility of reading travel books. Certainly every gentleman should know and be able to converse intelligently on the location, geography, and products of other countries; every merchant should know what the far places had to sell. What could be more entertaining to people of every walk of life than to hear of the strange customs, laws, religions and governments of the various lands in this world of ours?⁴ Similar appeals were made by other writers. What is more, they seem to have captured the public at which they aimed. A good indication of this widespread reading interest is had from the lists of subscribers given by some of these writers. In these lists,

³ John Harris, *Navigantium atque Itinerantium Bibliotheca*, 2 vols., London, 1744-1748, Preface to volume I. An interesting story is told by the Reverend Peter Heylyn, *Chorography in Four Books*, London, 1703, in his "To the Reader." The story reads like a page out of Dickens. Heylyn tells how he had been brought to trial before the "Committee for the Courts of Justice" in 1640, "on the complaint of Mr. Prynne, then newly return'd from his Confinement, and in great credit with the Vulgar." He was acquitted, but on his way from Westminster to White-Hall he was stopped by a "tall big Gentleman, who thrusting me rudely from the Wall, and looking over his Shoulder on me in a scornful manner, said in a hoarse Voice, these words, *Geography is better than Divinity*; and so passed along. . . . But sure I am. I have since thought very often of it; and that the thought thereof had its influence on me, in drawing me to look back on those Younger Studies, in which I was resolved to have dealt no more."

⁴ John Stevens, editor, *The Seventeen Years Travels of Peter de Cieza*, London, 1709, Dedication.

in addition to "gentlemen," one finds lawyers, doctors, teachers, clergymen, merchants, ships' captains, army men, and government officials.⁵

What strikes the reader most forcefully in the travel literature of the eighteenth century, is the great emphasis placed on trade and commerce, a fact not surprising when one considers how positively trade-mad people were in that trade-mad century. The English writer Erasmus Phillips is merely striking the keynote of his age when he tells the world that: "Trade is to the Body Politick as the Blood is to human body; it diffuses itself by the minutest Canals into every part of a Nation, and gives Life and Vigour to the whole: Without this, no Country can be happy within herself, or support herself without against the Attacks of a powerful Neighbor. Trade it is that brings us all the Aids, the Conveniences, the Luxury of Life; 'Tis she that encourages all Arts and Sciences, gives Hopes to Invention, and Riches to Industry; Strength, Wisdom and Policy are in her Train; Plenty, Liberty, and Happiness are her perpetual Companions."⁶ Nor is this an isolated instance of eighteenth century politico-economic thought. One has not to read far into the numerous tracts, essays and pamphlets of the period to find many such passages. Naturally travel writers became imbued with a similar philosophy of trade. Some, to be sure, wrote precisely with furtherance of trade in mind. Though others did not, they were for the most part loyal enough Englishmen to burn their share of incense at the shrine of Mercury, Roman god of merchants (and thieves), in one form or another. A study of the dedications, rescripts, edvertisements, prefaces and introductions of the authors themselves verifies this conclusion. Since it will be impossible here to consider all of them, it will be the purpose of this paper to study some of the principal travel works published at the beginning, middle and end of the eighteenth century.⁷

In 1704 Awnsham and John Churchill published what was to become one of the best known, best edited and most frequently

⁵ For examples of such lists cf. Pascoe Thomas, *A True and Impartial Journal of a Voyage to the South Seas*, London, 1745, and Richard Walter, *A Voyage Round the World*, London, 1748.

⁶ Erasmus Phillips, *The State of the Nation*, London, 1725, 1-2.

⁷ This does not mean that the writers of the seventeenth century did not have similar interests. Notice the way in which Purchas, for example, pointed with pride to the *Golden Hind*, which came back to England "with her belly full of Gold and Silver," and in effect bade Englishmen to go out and do like deeds. Samuel Purchas, *Purchas his Pilgrimage*, London, 1613, Book VIII, Chapter i, 603.

quoted collections of travels.⁸ At the beginning of the first volume, opposite the title page, is printed a rescript of William III giving the two brothers a "copyright" for fourteen years. Why the grant is made and in what precisely it consists is interesting enough; but more to our present concern is that part of the rescript proclaiming the usefulness of the volumes, that is their "great advantage as well to Trade as Navigation."

To be sure the advance in trade was not the sole aim of the Churchills in publishing their work. The sale of the work, the history and trends in navigation were further incentives to break into print. Thus at the beginning of the first volume there is "An Introductory Discourse, containing the whole History of Navigation from its original to this time."⁹ The essay opens with the statement: "Of all the inventions and Improvements the wit of man has discover'd and brought to Perfection, none seems to be so universally useful, profitable and necessary, as the Art of Navigation." The author then begins, after the manner of the times, with Noah's Ark, ordered to be built by God, and thought by some to have been the first vessel ever constructed. He, however, thinks that people must have had ships before that time.

Coming down to "Terra del Fuogo" the writer states that little need be said of it, because it is little known, "and *not worth conquering* by reason of its coldness."¹⁰ That it was not navigation alone, but navigation in relation to commerce which the author had in mind, is shown when he deals with the Spanish possessions. In summing up the various commodities which could be had from these, he tells us that "the principal are Gold, Silver, Pearls, Emeralds, Amethysts, Cochineal of several sorts, Indigo, Anatto, Logwood, Brasil, *Nicaragua* Wood, Brasilette, Fustick, *Ligum Vitae*, Sugar, Ginger, Cacao, Bairullas, Cotton, Red Wool, Tobacco of various sorts, Snuff. Hides raw and tann'd, Amber-greece of all

⁸ Awnsham and John Churchill, *A Collection of Voyages and Travels*, 4 vols., London, 1704. The first edition was completed in 1704 in four volumes folio, but already the two brothers had materials for two additional volumes. These were published in 1732, and together with a reprint of the first four, make up the second edition. A third edition, six volumes folio, was published 1744-1746. Meanwhile Thomas Osborne, in 1745 and 1747, edited two additional volumes from materials gathered from the library of the Earl of Oxford. These volumes are generally referred to as the Osborne collection, or, after their source, as the Oxford collection. The entire eight volumes were published as a whole by Osborne in 1752. References given by the present writer refer to the 1704 edition, except where otherwise stated.

⁹ *Ibid.*, I, ix-lxxiii.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, I, lxii, Col. 2, *Italics mine.*

sorts, Bezoar, Balsam of *Tolu*, of *Peru*, and of *Chile*, Jesuit Bark, Jallap, Mechoacan, Sarsaparilla, Sassafras, Tamarinds, Caffia, and many other things of lesser note."¹¹

Actually the ghost of trade prevades the whole four volumes. Nor can the present writer be charged with "seeing things." In his dedication to Thomas Carew, Esq., M.P., Thomas Osborne, editor of the well known edition of Churchill, states flatly: "though Amusement has in some Measure been regarded, the Choice of Subjects in this Collection has, with more Justice to the Reader, been designated for his Instruction in Cosmography, and for his more advantageous Knowledge of the separate Government, Revenue, Strength, Religion, Customs, Interests, Products, Trade, Commerce, and Navigation of each Country here described."¹² Though Osborne had his own two volumes of additions in view when he made the above statement, he might well have applied it to the entire work.

In 1711 Sir John Narbrough published an account of his voyage to the South Sea undertaken by command of Charles II. The general purpose of the undertaking is nicely brought out in Narbrough's instructions to Captain Fleming, one of the party and commander of the *Bachelor*.¹³ It was, in brief, to explore the coasts of South America beginning at La Plata, moving southward around the Strait of Magellan and then up the Chilean coast. If possible they were to lay the foundations of trade as they went along. Consequently orders were given not only to explore the coast with its bays, harbours, rivers, its climate, its winds, and the like, but also to note accurately the nature of the soil, its fruits, woods, grains, birds, beasts, minerals, etc. Again, the "Temper and Inclinations" of the Indians were to be noted, and whenever possible these were to be impressed with the power and wealth of Great Britain, all toward establishing trade relations in these lands. The ensuing account of the voyage abounds in references to trade and commerce.

Further indications of Britain's interest in the South Seas at this time is given by Captain Edward Cooke. Speaking of the "much talk'd of" South Sea trade in the introduction to volume II of his Relation, Cooke refers his readers to his first volume, where he has shown in what precisely this trade may consist. For a person to know what the various countries can offer for sale is

¹¹ *Ibid.*, I, lxiii, Col. 2.

¹² Osborne Edition, 1745, Dedication.

¹³ Sir John Narbrough, "Voyage to the South-Sea," in *An Account of Several Late Voyages and Discoveries*, London, 1711, 10-11.

sufficient, he thinks, to form a basis for judging trade possibilities.¹⁴ From his dedication to Robert, Earl of Oxford and Mortimer, Lord High Treasurer of the realm, Cooke clearly wrote with intent to further trade. He tells the nobleman that he is presenting a *Voyage* "principally intended to reap the Advantages of the South-Sea trade" of which his Lordship was the patron.¹⁵ It may be noted here that, a few years later, the editor of Frézier's *Voyage to the South Sea* dedicated his efforts to His Royal Highness George Prince of Wales and Governor of the South Sea Company.¹⁶ The Reverend Mr. Barclay would assure himself of patronage by dedicating his book to all the "Worthy Merchants of the City of London."¹⁷

Daniel Defoe's interest in the South Sea trade is too well known to necessitate any lengthy exposition. One typical example of this will suffice. In the first part of his *Voyage* he explains why this traffic is of greater advantage to Britain than the Oriental trade. In the Oriental trade Britain has to pay out money instead of merchandise for the wares she obtains. On the other hand, he tells us, the numerous peoples of the South Seas have no manufacture of their own and will therefore, especially after being civilized, take great quantities of whatever Britain has to offer in return for gold and perhaps spices, "the best Merchandise and Return in the World."¹⁸ Defoe cites his own experience as an

¹⁴ Captain Edward Cooke, *A Voyage to the South Sea*, 2 vols., London, 1712, II, Introduction, ix.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, I, Dedication.

¹⁶ Amédée François Frézier, *A Voyage to the South-Sea*, London, 1717.

¹⁷ Barclay, *Universal Traveller*, Dedication. The following excerpt from Barclay is typical of such dedications: "Gentlemen, The following sheets treating of a Subject, in which You have so considerable an Interest, (as they give a Detail of the Beginning, Progress, and Settlement of the trade to both the Indies, which your Predecessors, Merchants of the City of London, so gloriously carried on, at the Expense of their Blood and Treasure) I could not chuse fitter Patrons for my Traveller than you, who not only follow the noble Pattern set you by them, in venturing your Fortunes, and, many of you, your Lives, to promote that Trade, and, consequently, the Riches of the Nation but with a Courage, becoming a Society of Gentlemen, and Free-Born Subjects, dare make a brave Stand for Liberty, and for the Freedom of Commerce, whenever you apprehend any Encouragement like to be made upon them; of which, without Doubt, You are the best Judges."

¹⁸ Daniel Defoe, *A New Voyage Round the World by a Course never sailed before. Being a Voyage undertaken by some Merchants, who afterwards proposed the Setting up an East-India Company in Flanders*, London, 1725, Part I, 177. In his *Plan of the English Commerce*, published a few years later, in 1728, Defoe uses Tacitus-like methods to arouse the English. He chides the merchants, manufacturers, etc., for failing to make a complete study of all the elements making for trade, at the same time holding up the Spaniards and others as models of industry and venturesomeness in the matter.

illustration. On his voyage, gold, spices and oriental silks were obtained at Manila in return for British manufactures; the spices and silks were taken to Hispanic America and sold for gold. In the eyes of eighteenth century mercantilists here was the perfect trade pattern.¹⁹

The decades of the mid-eighteenth century were to witness an almost constant struggle between Great Britain on the one hand and Spain and France on the other. The War of Jenkins' Ear, begun in 1739, viewed in the light of the series of wars for control of overseas empire, was only a prelude to the broader War of the Austrian Succession, which was not to end until 1748. Yet Jenkins signifies more in the story of individual interest in colonial products, for Jenkins in his trade enterprise at Portobelo was endeavoring to break in upon the official trade agreements made between England and Spain in 1713 and the privileged traders. The peace of 1748 ushered in a brief respite which lasted until the Seven Years' War broke out in 1755. This too had its colonial counterpart, lasting until the Peace of Paris in 1763. Throughout the struggle Spain, to say nothing of France, suffered greatly in her colonies. Already in 1739 Vernon was sacking Portobelo. Cartagena was attacked and almost taken by the British in 1741, while at the same time Anson was patrolling the Pacific successfully seeking Spanish prey. The end of it all was to find Britain richer by Canada and East and West Florida.

These wars are now regarded as having been essentially commercial in nature. France and Spain were making a last dying effort to stave off the ever increasing power of the British. It is not at all surprising therefore to find such British travel literature as was printed during these years to be full of interest in trade and commerce. Not only was information being sought such as would be beneficial once the peace was established, but, more

¹⁹ What Defoe's contemporaries understood by a "favorable balance" of trade and the importance they attached to it is nicely brought out by William Wood in his *Survey of Trade*, London, 1722. On pages 81 and 82 of this essay Wood sets down what he calls the four "Marks of a Beneficial Trade." In substance they are as follows: 1. That is good trade which absorbs superfluous home manufactures. 2. Beneficial too is that which brings in raw products of manufacture especially when exchanged for finished wares. 3. Advantage is also had when manufactures are exchanged for manufactures, or commodities for commodities. Even when money is paid as part of the price, this is agreeable to good business if the major part of the wares thus brought in are resold out of the nation. 4. Generally speaking the re-exporting of imports is always advantageous, since in this way the carrying-trade of the nation is furthered. The maxims for testing the value of every trade which Wood then gives, ring the changes over and over on a favorable balance of trade.

immediately, such as would be of advantage to merchant and military alike while the nations were still at war.

Shortly after the beginning of the first of the two mid-century conflicts, Doctor John Campbell published the first edition of his *History of Spanish America*. In the title the writer reveals his intentions.²⁰ Then, in his preface, Campbell states that it is "the desire which the Publick discovers of being thoroughly acquainted with the past and present situation of the Spanish West Indies," which has impelled him to his undertaking. His chief aim will be to throw light on the unamended errors made by his Catholic Majesty in the Americas. Furthermore, if ever these errors will be righted, it will be because of the present unsuccessful war. All is not lost for Spain. Rather her affairs can still be a "Credit of the Crown, and the Happiness of the People." The solution is simple enough. All Spain has to do is to become an ally instead of an enemy of the British. "As an Ally, we are more concerned than any other to protect and to promote their Interests, because they never can interfere with ours; and in respect to Commerce, we can supply their Wants cheaper and more effectually than any other Nation, and also take more of their Goods in Return. On the other hand, if at Variance, we can at any Time defeat all their Projects in Europe, and in a great measure cut off their Intercourse with America." Certainly, he argued, the French alliance can do Spain no good. The sooner the Spanish act for their own interests instead of abetting the French intrigues, the better it will be for all concerned.²¹

Such in effect is Campbell's understanding of the situation. The whole of the work following is shot through with references to trade. It is precisely the type of book that a merchant, such as Campbell calls himself, would write. Scarcely a chapter passes without stimulating mention of trade, manufactures, mines and precious metals.

At the opening of the eighteenth century John Harris, scientist,

²⁰ John Campbell, *A Concise History of the Spanish America; containing A succinct Relation of the Discovery and settlements of its several Colonies: A Circumstantial Detail of their respective Situation, Extent, Commodities, Trade, &c. And a full and clear Account of the Commerce with Old Spain by the Galleons, Flota, &c. As also of the Contraband Trade with the English, Dutch, Danes, and Portuguese. Together with An Appendix, In which is comprehended an exact Description of Paraguay. Collected chiefly from Spanish Writers*, London, 1741. A second edition was published in 1747 under the title: *The Spanish Empire in America*. Except for the title page this is an exact reproduction of the 1741 edition. The pagination is the same throughout.

²¹ *Ibid.*, Preface, v-vii.

divine, and topographer, was commissioned by London booksellers to edit a collection of voyages.²² This work, first published in 1705, quite likely was inspired by the Churchills' popularity and by a desire to compete with their *Collection* in the book market. Still the two works are different. Whereas the Churchills give a more or less exact reproduction of specific writings such as those of Ovalle, Del Techo, etc., Harris attempts to write a sort of universal history of voyages and travels, as frequently as not digesting in his own words the findings of his authorities.²³ Harris's *Collection* was improved and reedited by John Campbell in 1744-1748. It is thus quite fitting that it be considered here along with Campbell's own work rather than with the earlier writers.

The dedication "To the Merchants of Great-Britain," is a classic example of contemporary British trade philosophy. At the outset the writer avers that he could not have chosen more suitable patrons, since in his work he owes so much to them.²⁴ Moreover, considering his purpose to depict the history and advantages of commerce "in a true light," his choice is all the more suitable. Mankind, he shows, dispersed by God as a punishment, is now drawn together by trade and commerce. In time, with God's approval, trade has come to lighten the burden of men while increasing their happiness. To this course England has been no exception.

To Commerce we owe our Wealth; for though Labour may improve, though Arms may extend, yet Commerce only can enrich a Country. It is this that establishes and extends Manufactures, and while it employs all Ranks of People, provides suitable Rewards for their several Employments. It is this, and this alone that can excite and encourage universal Industry, by providing, that all who take Pains, shall reap Profit, and that what raises the Fortunes of Individuals, shall prove at the same Time, and in the same Degree, beneficial to Society.

Finally, since the function of works like his is to give such information as would further the common weal, the author vows that he has done all in his power towards encouraging and extending trade as a "means of making us great, wealthy, powerful and happy People."

This same theme is carried over into the introduction where the writer waxes almost eloquent. Britain, he says, has wares in

²² John Harris, *Navigantium atque Itinerantium Bibliotheca*, 2 vols., fol., London, 1705. Further editions 1744-1748 and 1764. The edition referred to here is that edited by John Campbell, London, 1744-1748.

²³ Edward Godfrey Cox, *A Reference Guide to the Literature of Travel*, 2 vols., Seattle, 1935-1938, I, 10.

²⁴ The writer of the dedication is evidently John Campbell, since it is dated December 3, 1745. Harris died in 1719.

abundance to dispose of, and the world is full of people who want them. Furthermore, if some "modern Sceptick" should demand where these be, "the following Sheets will shew, that the Means of Finding are very well known." What is needed therefore is "Will" and "Vigour." If these are present then the divine saying: "If we search, we shall find; if we knock, it will be opened," will be found true of temporal as well as of spiritual affairs.²⁵ Thus the Scriptures were made to argue for British enterprises!

A like consideration of trade guided Emanuel Bowen in the format of his *Geography*. The study of geography in itself, he insisted, is useless if no people inhabit the lands considered. But where there are people there is a story to be told. And hence the role of history. Furthermore, since dates and facts are dry as dust, these must needs be livened up by "political Reflections." Lastly he brings forth an argument of utmost concern to the enterprising Britisher; though one knows all things, without a proper knowledge of trade, he can not be said to know the world. Above all else then "the Produce, Commodities, Manufactures and Commerce of every Country" must be given due consideration in the work that follows.²⁶ Actually the author refers to his book as a "universal Map of Commerce" for the trader.²⁷

An interesting two volume work appeared in 1757 entitled *An Account of the European Settlements in America*. The author is sometimes supposed to have been the illustrious Edmund Burke. Be this as it may, he leaves no doubt as to his intentions, which were expressly the furtherance of trade and commerce. Even the civil and natural history of the settlements will be "little considered," and, when treated, only in so far as they offer help to understanding commercial matters.²⁸

In 1758 there was published at London an English translation of Juan and Ulloa's *Relación histórica del viaje á la América meridional*. This work, to the mind of the editor, should prove most acceptable to the British, since "nothing seems to have been more carefully considered by the authors, than the commercial history of these countries."²⁹ One after another the editor points out the

²⁵ Harris, *Navigantium atque Itinerantium Bibliotheca*, Introduction, xvi.

²⁶ Emanuel Bowen, *A Complete System of Geography*, 2 vols., London, 1747, Preface, vii.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, x.

²⁸ [Edmund Burke (?)], *An Account of the European Settlements in America*, 2 vols., London, 1757-1758, Preface, 4.

²⁹ Juan, George, and Ulloa, Don Antonio de, *A Voyage to South-America*, 2 vols., London, 1758, Preface, x-xi.

interesting features of the work,—the proper commodities of each section, how they are processed, their value, the nature of manufactures, the produce of the various mines, transportation facilities, contraband trade, communication with Europe, the nature and extent of native trade. The English editor evidently saw in his publication an advantage to business.

English publishers had from the time of Hakluyt drawn widely on Catholic missionaries for information on distant places. With the opening of the New World the missionaries of the Americas, particularly the Jesuits, were to offer great help in filling out numerous gaps in the world's knowledge of those lands.

The reason why the fathers were consulted is to be found in their writings as well as in the peculiar position of the men themselves. Almost a century ago, in his introduction to the translation of an excerpt from Baegert's *Nachrichten*, Charles Rau paused to compliment the Jesuits of bygone years for their wonderful work in the New World. Even Protestants, he wrote, though they may differ with "the tendencies of that order," must admit that they "deserve great credit for their zeal in propagating a knowledge of the countries and nations they visited in the New World."³⁰ Rau concluded his eulogy with a quotation from a contemporary writer, J. H. Kohn:

The missionaries and discoverers whom the order of the Jesuits sent forth were for the most part not only possessed of the courage of martyrs, and of statesmanlike qualities, but likewise of great knowledge and learning. They were enthusiastic travellers, naturalists, and Geographers; they were the best mathematicians and astronomers of their time. They have been the first to give us faithful and circumstantial accounts of the new countries and nations they visited. There are few districts in the interior of America concerning which the Jesuits have not supplied us with the oldest and best works . . . and there are few rivers, lakes, and mountains in the interior, which they have not been the first to draw upon our maps.

Writers of earlier centuries were not without a similar appreciation of the scholarly writings of the missionaries. Perhaps one of the best instances of admiration, mingled with prejudice and even fear of the Jesuits, is to be found in the case of Lockman, who nevertheless thought their letters sufficiently important to deserve publication. In the preface of his *Travels of the Jesuits* he boldly states that "no Men are better qualified to describe Na-

³⁰ Charles Rau, "An Account of the Aboriginal Inhabitants of the California Peninsula," *Reports: Smithsonian Institute*, Washington, D. C., 1863, Introduction, 357.

tions and Countries than the Jesuits." Lockman claims that the reasons for this are first of all their education, learning and knowledge of languages. Add to these qualifications their knowledge of arts and sciences and an "insinuating Address, to glide into Courts, where access is often even denied to all but themselves." All these factors, he thinks, together with a thorough knowledge of the natives with whom they abide, frequently for many years, gave the Jesuits a much more thorough knowledge of a nation than such as is had by merchants or travellers who merely touch its shores.³¹

R. Gosting in the preface of his *Travels* sums up the reasons why the Jesuits could be consulted with profit as follows:

The Missionaries being settled Inhabitants of those Countries they write of, speaking the Languages and reading the Books, are able to acquaint us with many Curiosities, which Travellers in passing through can never be Masters of. The Writers of those Letters make the Knowledge of those People they are among their Study, and converse with all Sorts from the Highest to the Meanest; they are Men chosen out of Many for that Purpose, and consequently the only Persons that can set us Right in our Notions of those People so remote from us, and so different in all Respects.³²

Publishers of the famed Churchill *Collection* also relied much on the Jesuit writers to fill out their volumes. Why they did so is explained in the "advertisements" placed before the accounts borrowed. Thus, in presenting Father Barri's account of Cochin-China, the editor mentions how the writer, living for years with the people he described, was thoroughly conversant with their language. His account, therefore, is not like that of merchants and traders who merely see the port cities and take the rest on hearsay.³³ In like manner the account of Father Sepp's voyage to Paraguay is included in the work because of the numerous, hitherto unknown, incidents it contains.³⁴ The third volume of the *Collection* begins with Ovalle's history of Chile, which, as the editor sees it, is the only good history of Chile in existence. The story is complete and accurate, in spite of Ovalle's modest presentation of it, and as such it demands recommendation rather than excuse. However, since the translator has already given

³¹ Lockman, *Travels of the Jesuits*, 2 vols., London, 1743, I, viii-ix.

³² R. Gosting, *The Travels of several Learned Missionaries of the Society of Jesus*, London, 1714, Preface.

³³ Christopher Barri, "An Account of Cochin-China," in Churchill, *Collection*, II, 787-838, To the Reader, 787.

³⁴ Anton Sepp, "An Account of a Voyage from Spain to Paraguaría," in Churchill, *Collection*, IV, 633-664, Advertisement to the Reader, IV, 634.

"the Author and his Work that honourable Character they deserve," the editor thinks that no more need be said to recommend its perusal.³⁵ Last, coming to Techo's relation, the editor after treating of its contents declares that there is scarcely any reason to question its truthfulness. Using a bit of historical criticism, he shows that the author had nothing to gain by lying. Furthermore, having lived twenty-five years in the country he describes, there is no danger that he should lack sufficient knowledge for accurate presentation of his account.³⁶

In brief, then, the reasons why the Jesuits were consulted by writers of travel literature were that they were peculiarly equipped in education and training to make accurate observations. They knew, or soon came to know, the language of the people with whom they resided, and were thus able to observe at first hand what others got from hearsay. Living in the interior of the lands they described, sometimes for years, they had a further advantage over such writers as came to see little more than the port cities and commercial centers of the land. Furthermore, according to their English critics, the Jesuits were essentially honest, except perhaps when they began to talk about "miracles" and such-like wondrous things. However, narratives based on miracles could be, and generally were, easily purged from what were otherwise considered accurate writings.³⁷

It was not only the shorter works of the missionaries that were to see the light of day in English garb. An English translation was made of Acosta's *Historia natural y moral de las Indias* from the Dutch version in 1598 and from the original Spanish in 1604. Burriel's *Noticia de la California*, long ascribed to Venegas, was published in English in 1759 and again in 1764. Charlevoix's *History of Paraguay* appeared at London in 1769, Clavigero's *History of Mexico* in 1787, Molina's *History of Chile* in 1809, and Dobrizhoffer's *Account of the Abipones* in 1822. Falkner's *Descrip-*

³⁵ Alonso de Ovalle, "An Historical Relation of the Kingdom of Chili," in Churchill, *Collection*, III, 1-138, Preface, vi.

³⁶ Nicholas del Techo, "The History of the Provinces of Paraguay, Tucuman, Rio de la Plata, Parana, Guiana and Urvaica, . . ." in Churchill, *Collection*, IV, 80-807, Preface.

³⁷ The British were not the only ones to act in this manner. With the banishment of the Jesuits from France, government officials there seem to have made a practice of destroying such Jesuit records as pertained to their religious life, retaining those which had any economic value. In this way countless documents pertaining to the early history of the Society of Jesus have been lost. Cf. Jerome V. Jacobsen, "Documents: Marquette's Ordination," *Mid-America*, XXXII, January, 1950, 48.

tion of Patagonia originally written in English was published at Hereford in 1774.

Nor must it be imagined that the works of these missionaries, whether published as individual volumes or as parts of larger collections, failed to leave their imprint on the writers who followed them. A list of Englishmen who used the Jesuit missionaries as sources would have to include, among others, Edward Cooke, Thomas Bankes, Samuel Purchas, Woodes Rogers, Patrick Barclay, John Campbell, Pascoe Thomas, Emanuel Bowen, Alexander Dalrymple, John Hamilton Moore, William Robertson, John Pinkerton and James Burney. It is scarcely possible here to treat of the writings of all of these authors. By way of example, however, it will be useful and enlightening to note how two of them, Captain Woodes Rogers and Emanuel Bowen, used the missionary writers to gather information for furtherance of British trade and commerce in the Americas.

If Captain Woodes Rogers had never written up his voyage, he would still be an interesting character to the historian and the literateur, for it was he who rescued Alexander Selkirk, better known as Robinson Crusoe, from the Island of Juan Fernández in the winter of 1708-1709. Rogers was in command of a privateering expedition sent to the South Sea by "divers merchants of Bristol." From Juan Fernández the small, ill-rigged squadron made its way up the coast of Peru to California, thence to Guam and Batavia, around the Cape of Good Hope, and back to England. In his *Voyage* Rogers told an interesting tale of success and defeat incurred during the course of the expedition.³⁸ But he did more than that. Though he little more than touched at the various coastlands, in his published account of the voyage Rogers treated of the various countries in considerable detail. For his authorities on matters of which he himself was ignorant, he relied heavily on several Jesuit writers.

It is to be noted that Rogers was primarily interested in trade. Considering the backing he got from the Merchants of Bristol, this is rather to be expected. Hence no one is surprised to hear him say of his account: "I have confin'd myself to those parts which are most likely to be frequented for Trade, and quoted my Authors from whom I had the Collections; which I did not insert at random, but when I found them to agree with the Relations of those who

³⁸ Captain Woodes Rogers, *A Cruising Voyage Round the World*, London, 1712.

had been in the places, or with the Accounts of the Natives, with whom I had opportunities to converse."³⁹

Rogers devotes pages 340 to 356 of his work to a description of Chile. He starts this selection with a quotation from Ovalle, and then adds: "I come now to give a brief view of what Ovalle, a Native, says to it in general."⁴⁰ From here on to page 356 it is for all intents and purposes Ovalle who speaks. At times the father is followed very closely. A comparison of texts shows that it was Churchill's translation that was used. Rogers takes from Ovalle matter describing the mines, the gold, silver, lead, quick-silver, the lumber, grains, fruit, the climate, rivers, etc., of Chile. Furthermore he takes care to add: "So that according to *Ovalle*, Merchants may trade from hence to other parts in the *South Sea*, and especially to Lima, from 100 to 200 *per cent*. Profit, of which I have also been informed by our Prisoners."⁴¹ Ovalle, incidentally, is also used for information on the Rio de la Plata.⁴²

In addition to Ovalle, Father Sepp is cited concerning the Uruguay River. Indeed, in Rogers' "Account of the River La Plata," Sepp is constantly referred to from pages 75 to 92. It is also evident from matter contained in pages 70 to 73 that the Captain used Acuña, or Acugna as he spells the name. He also makes mention of a map of the Marañon River engraved by the Jesuits at Quito.⁴³ More interesting still, del Techo, after being cited right down the page is called "Our Author."⁴⁴ Further importance is to be attached to Rogers' remark that: "The Curious who would know more of the Manners of the Natives, or the History and particular Product of this large Country, may find it in *Gemelli*, *Father Sepp*, and *Father Teche*; but this is enough for my purpose, to show that a vast Field of Trade may be open'd here, and how dangerous it may prove to all *Europe*, if the House of *Bourbon* continue possess'd of that Trade."⁴⁵ Can there be any doubt that Rogers used information here from Jesuit writers to further British trade?

Emanuel Bowen, who called his work *A Complete System of Geography*, and referred to it as a "universal Map of Commerce"

³⁹ *Ibid.*, Introduction, xvi.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 341.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 344.

⁴² *Ibid.*, 74.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, 72. Edward Cook was a first lieutenant in Roger's expedition, serving aboard the *Duchess*. His account of the voyage, published in 1712, contained Father Fritz's map referred to here by Rogers.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, 98.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, 92.

for the trader, affords another good example of the use of missionary writers.⁴⁶ Bowen treats of Hispanic America in the second volume of his work from pages 538 to 620. Throughout these pages one finds mentioned Fathers Acosta, Acuña, Ovalle, del Techo, Sepp, Neyel, Kino, Picolo and Fritz. Frequent mention is made of the *Lettres Édifiantes* to which some of the men just mentioned were important contributors.

To proceed in orderly fashion it may be well here to travel with Bowen as he moves through the Americas from one country to another. The first of these touched on in the book is Paraguay. Bowen mentions that his chief source of information has been Father Techo, but that he also consulted De Laet, Herrera, Sanson, Frézier, Rogers, La Mortinière and, more particularly, Sepp, Labat and Feuillée.⁴⁷ Judging from the amount of matter Bowen got from Father Sepp, he might have included his name with that of del Techo in the first place. From pages 538 to 546 Sepp is referred to constantly. Bowen finds interest in Sepp's saying that in Paraguay "Silver was there cheaper than Iron, and a common Twopenny Knife would fetch a Crown, a Two shilling Hat ten or twelve Crowns, a Gun of ten or twelve Shillings thirty Crowns." ⁴⁸ Sepp is quoted on the extent of Paraguay and on the large number of horses and mules to be had there. Mention is also made of his description of the cataract of the Uruguay and its obstructing the Spanish trade with the Indians.⁴⁹

When Bowen comes to speak of "Terra Magellanica," as he calls the country to the south, it is evident that Ovalle and del Techo were much consulted. Here, as elsewhere, he seems at times to have used one or other of the fathers as he was quoted by somebody else. For example he refers to "Father *Alonzo Óvaglie*, or *Ovalle*, as Captain Rogers calls him."⁵⁰ Ovalle is so constantly cited when Bowen writes about Chili from pages 551 to 563 that one gets the impression that the *Historical Relation of the Kingdom of Chili* lay open at his side.

Arriving in Peru, Bowen mentions that the early history of that country is quite mixed up, due in part to the faulty methods of the Indians in keeping their records, in part to the "romancing" of the Spaniards. However, he continues, that the reader may be

⁴⁶ Emanuel Bowen, *A Complete System of Geography*, 2 vols., London, 1747.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, II, 547, Col. 2.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, II, 540, Col. 1.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, II, 538-540.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, II, 548.

satisfied, "we shall give him a short Extract of what one of the best *Spanish* Writers acquaints us with; I mean *Acosta*, a learned and judicious Man, who became acquainted upon the Spot with the History he has given us; to which we shall add a few Particulars from other Writers of the best Note."⁵¹ However it is not merely on the ancient history of Peru that *Acosta* is used. It seems to have been impossible for the Average English writer to read the father's account without including what he had to say of the fabulous mines of Potosí! Furthermore, *Acosta* comes in for his share of reference when Bowen writes of New Spain. Citing the father constantly throughout the seventeen double-columned pages that deal with this topic, Bowen shows that he really believed that it was *Acosta* who gave "the best Account of New Spain, in that called his *Natural and Moral History of the Indies*."⁵²

Writing about "New Mexico," Bowen uses "*Gemelli*, the Popish Missionary, whom we have often quoted." In addition to *Gemelli* Father Kino or "*Caino*," is referred to in connection with his explorations in Lower California.⁵³ At the same time Bowen states that: "To Father *Caino's* Account, we shall add the following Extract of the Report of the State of the *Spanish* Missions, settled by the Jesuits in California, as it was presented by Father Picolo, one of the first Founders of the Mission, to the Royal Council at *Guadalaxara* in Mexico, in February 1702."⁵⁴

Perhaps greater details by way of more frequent excerpts might have been given here to show more precisely the nature of the items borrowed from Jesuit writers. However, such may readily be had by consulting the *Geography* itself. What is important is that Bowen wrote his "universal Map of Commerce" largely for merchants, and that he drew every manner of information from the Jesuits in the process.

Travel writers and publishers of the last decades of the century seem to have been no different in general from those of the first. Consequently, with a view to avoiding needless repetition, but one of them will be considered here, namely Alexander Dalrymple. According to Cox, Dalrymple published his *Historical Collection* as an additional argument for the great benefits to be derived from the South Sea trade.⁵⁵ How true this is may be

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, II, 564, Col. 1.

⁵² *Ibid.*, II, 600, Col. 2.

⁵³ *Ibid.*, II, 619, Col. 1.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, II, 619, Col. 2.

⁵⁵ Cox, *Reference Guide*, I, 19.

gained from what follows. Indeed, even in the dedication, the editor presents his work: "Not to Him who Discovered scarcely anything but Patagonians. Not to Him who From 20° South Latitude, Thinking it *impossible* to go On Discovery, into 30° South. Determined to come Home round the World. . . . But to the Man who . . . shall *persist* through *every* Obstacle, and . . . Succeed in establishing Intercourse with a Southern Continent."⁵⁶ What Dalrymple is especially anxious for is that populous lands be discovered in the South Seas, lands which have had no intercourse with Europe. These should not be conquered, for that is the mistake which the Spaniards made in the case of Mexico and Peru. Rather, the friendship of such peoples as are found should be cultivated with a view to trade, which would redound to the mutual benefit of all concerned.⁵⁷

This last point is interesting. Friendship could only come with knowledge of the customs, habits, and needs of the natives. Furthermore, if it was to be maintained, a thorough understanding of their temperment was imperative. One can see why it was not the anthropologists alone who were interested in the numerous "moral histories" of the Indies written by Acosta, Ovalle, Del Techo, Clavigero, and others, which treated specifically and in great detail of these very matters. Indeed, the very eagerness with which the writers and publishers of travel literature grabbed the writings of even the hated Jesuits such as the four just mentioned, to say nothing of many others, is only another indication of the determination to use any means provided it be to the furtherance of British trade and commerce.

HERMAN J. MULLER

University of Detroit

⁵⁶ Alexander Dalrymple, *An Historical Collection of the several Voyages and Discoveries in the South Pacific Ocean*, 2 vols., London, 1770-1771, Dedication.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, Introduction, I, xxvii-xxviii.

The Religion of Bolívar

I. The Problem

A niche in the hall of historical fame awaits the scholar who produces a definitive life of Bolívar—Simón José Antonio de la Santísima Trinidad Bolívar. This statement has been made often before and it will very probably be true a hundred years from now. Still, like many writers in the past a greater number of people will in the future take up their pens to have their say about Bolívar, some inspired by the drama of his life, some urged by the research instinct to clarify at least one phase of achievement, some goaded to an interpretation of his actions in the light of their particular professions. Each has come to take or will take a stand for or against the Liberator and in general to prove his point in an article or book, while only a few scholars have attempted a fair appraisal of the highly controversial words and deeds of Bolívar.

It seems to be an increasingly impossible task to be objective and definitive about the lives of any Latin American dictator. The task is trebly difficult in the case of the pioneer dictator, Bolívar, the paragon for scores of Latin American rulers who have "regenerated" their respective nations since independence. Bolívar either was by nature a pattern of mind and action for future leaders or he consciously set himself to establishing a pattern. The principles which guided him have persisted in various degrees for well over a hundred years, quite to the ruination of democracy. But who is to call into question the deeds of the great Liberator?

The essence of the Bolivarian revolt seems to lie in the complete break with all known European and American rules of conduct, political, economic, social and religious. The failure of Bolívar lay in his inability to establish a new and suitable code of life for the republics of his liberation. This inability stems from his character, his standards of thought and action. It was hardly to be expected that one following no written or traditional code of laws, but rather flexible principles, could communicate to posterity more than he possessed. No one will deny that the Bolivarian posterity made ample use of flexible principles in government, and so negated all constitutional progress.

It has therefore been possible to render judgment on Bolívar and his achievement according to the manner in which he conformed

or did not conform to any one of the codes of government of his times, by the code of absolutism, of parliamentarianism, by the code of the French Revolution or of Napoleon, or by the new North American standards of democracy. None of these did he accept, and adherents of no one of these forms would accept Bolívar. He favored parts and repudiated parts of every known governmental process from the age of Pericles. He did not recognize that each system was a body of laws, while his own plan was a conglomeration, chiefly, it may be added, of opinions, of which some were very sound. If judged by the flexible set of standards upon which he acted in military and governmental affairs he would stand condemned for inconsistency, even as he had condemned himself by his final despair over what he had wrought. In the presence of these many norms for reaching a verdict about Bolívar there is no wonder about the number of verdicts reached.

Your definitive biographer will be confronted by a huge and delicate task. Taking Bolívar's letters and pronouncements he will have no way of knowing if Bolívar meant what he said, if he meant all or part of what he said, if he spoke for the moment or from solid and persistent conviction, or if his words were inspired by the moment's emotion. The biographer will forever attempt to sift bombast from sincerity, truth from balderdash, sage prophecy from wishful guessing. The scholar cannot longer go on the frayed assumption that Bolívar was a great liberator, therefore everything he did and said was great. In like manner the scholar must test again the documents left by Bolívar's associates and contemporaries, where he will find the same emotionalism and self-interest depicting the Liberator as a hero, a Solon, a deity, or as an enemy, a common dictator, a traitor. Historians and journalists of the early republican period must be scrutinized as to their veracity, suspicion and bias. Perhaps nothing more difficult to assess in all the literature about Bolívar is the welter of patriotic and good-neighborly glorifications appearing in the past fifty years. By utilizing fact, fiction, legend, tradition, interpretation, and select passages of his writings a host of writers has produced the very untrustworthy image of a magnificent Bolívar, despite the sober works of such historians as Professors N. A. N. Cleven, W. S. Robertson, Mary Watters, Carlos Pereyra, Pedro Leturia, and a few others.¹

¹ It will serve no purpose to present in this article an evaluation of each of the writers who have contributed to the list of works on Bolívar. The list would now run to more than two printed volumes. In less than the last twenty years five complete bibliographies have been compiled and are printed or typed. Other volumes contain more general bibliographies.

To illustrate the general problem of painting a true picture of Bolívar we may consider the particular problem of his religion or spiritual life. Egged on by a generation of college students who have read to their befuddlement about the hero of South American independence it has finally become incumbent upon this writer to set down in print an opinion on the question: Was Bolívar a Catholic? For a score of years students have asked and have been annoyed by the professorial questions returned to them. Do you mean: What was his official attitude toward the official Church or his personal attitude toward the Church? Or his attitude toward churchmen—the particular pope and the particular bishops? Or his attitude toward religion? Was he anti-religious, anti-Catholic, anti-clerical? The students waive the qualifications and persist in their query to find out simply if Bolívar practiced the Catholic religion and followed Christian principles in his personal and official relations with his fellowmen, lay and cleric. The question is fundamental to the study of Bolívar's character.

Here in religious matters we have a very ancient body of laws by which all men may be judged and by which in the Catholic belief all men will be judged—the Ten Commandments. Besides these there are for Catholics the counsels, precepts and dogmas of the Church. Where the issue is a man's internal motives, or, his interior concept of the rightness or wrongness of an action, it is not within our province to sit in judgment. However the exterior acts or the writings of an individual can be classified according to laws as objectively right or wrong, moral or immoral or amoral, ethical or unethical, and this apart from the subjective element.

Once Bolívar had attained to the stature of a military genius who had cracked the power of Spain, his idolizers ransacked his past for details of his life. Around a few known facts they have built a story of his childhood and adolescence that would befit so great a man. We might glance at these early years and their influences to discover what part his training played in the formation of his religious principles and his character.

Nearly a hundred contain documents necessary for the coverage of the age of Bolívar. Items on Bolívar and his times, if published now, will run to about three volumes. Both the published documents and the writings are badly in need of scholarly criticism and editing, except for what has been accomplished more recently by those trained in research techniques. Checking for instance the most widely known set, the thirty-two volume *Memorias del General O'Leary*, is a task sufficient to make one shudder. The very physical bulk of the Bolívar bibliography conspires to make him appear a gigantic figure.

II. The First Fifteen Years

His family tree has been diligently traced and his ancestors back to the Visigoths are of academic interest, except for a great-great grandmother, whose bar sinister might never have been brought into print if her great-great grandson had not emerged in glory. His forebears in the Caribbean, long before making Venezuela their home, appear to have been financially comfortable colonials of aristocratic tastes and probably of aristocratic descent. They were trusted by the government and were Catholic in faith. This they bequeathed through generations along with, though we would be hard to put to prove it, the do or die, non-compromising spirit of the Conquest. After about two hundred years in the New World, the Bolívar line produced a revolutionary against the ancestral Spanish customs.

Simón was born on July 24, 1783, the fourth and last child of Don Juan Vicente Bolívar y Ponte and Maria de la Concepción Palacios y Blanco.² To the mind of some the father, a colonel in the militia, ranchman, and mine owner, was a good Catholic while to others he was "broad-minded" and even revolutionary in thought. A few scraps of evidence give rise to the latter opinion,³ but there is no gauge for registering the height of his Catholicity or of his rebellious attitude. He had married Maria when she was fourteen to the day and he was forty-six. Ten years later they begot Simón. No signs or portents heralded his birth. Nor are any recorded for his baptism in the Catholic Church on July 30. What influence the disparity of ages between his father and mother may have had upon Simón's future is open to conjecture.

Descriptions and pictures of the house in which the baby passed his infancy have been made available. Many pages have been written about his relatives, about the colonial scene, about the ferment of ideas in Europe and America, about the savants of Caracas, their discussions of the revolutionary ideas, about the religious and educational circumstances of Caracas. All this laudable research occasioned much later by Simón reveals nothing about his babyhood. Thirty-two years later he mentions gratefully the first influence after his birth. Then from Cuzco on July 10, 1825, he wrote to his sister Antonia concerning his Negro nurse, Hipólita. "I send to

² These simple biographical data and the chronology following do not seem to call for the customary footnote references, and this writer does not wish to point out all the inaccuracies of many authors.

³ William Spence Robertson, *Life of Miranda*, Chapel Hill, 1929, I, 28-29.

you a letter from my mother, Hipólita, in order that you will give her all that she wants; so that you do for her as though she were your own mother, her milk has nourished my life, and I have known no other parent [padre] than her."⁴ It is supposed from this passage that servants trained the children in the large Bolívar home as they did in many Creole families. At least, Simón seems always to have felt deeply for the enslaved Negroes and never to have expressed racial antipathy for the freedmen, a solid Christian principle.

Simón apparently had no recollection of his father, who lived less than three years after Simón's arrival. Since during the next six years there was no reason to suppose that a future military genius was at play about the house, all bright sayings and all descriptions of his boyhood training were left unwritten. They had to be recalled years afterward by observers whose memories were stretched to the limit, and who were influenced to an indeterminable extent by the renown of the Liberator.

The Bolívar home was completely broken with the death of the mother when Simón was nine. They say it was of tuberculosis. Realized or unrealized the loss to the children of a mother's watchful influence was tragic. The children were divided. The orphaned Simón went under the guardianship of his uncle, Esteban Palacios. From then on, with a share in the family fortune of about 500,000 pesos, he was without the bridle of any particular authority. What influence his mother, ill and burdened with the care of the estates, may have had on his tender years is not clear. He had vague recollections of her and on the very day on which he called Hipólita his only parent he wrote to his Uncle Esteban who had returned impoverished from a long absence in Spain:

My dear uncle Esteban and good godfather:

With what joy for me were you resurrected yesterday! Yesterday I learned that you were alive and were living in our beloved fatherland. How many memories flocked to my mind in an instance! My mother, my good mother, so much the likeness of you, arose from the tomb and was before me. My most tender childhood, the confirmation and my godfather were

⁴ Vicente Lecuna, Ed., *Cartas del Libertador*, Caracas, 1929-1930, (10 volumes), and New York, 1948, (3 volumes), V, 19. For the most recent translation of much of this set see *Selected Writings of Bolívar*, Compiled by Vicente Lecuna, Edited by Harold A. Bierck, Jr., Translated by Lewis Bertrand, Two Volumes, Published by Banco de Venezuela, New York, N. Y., 1951. The letter referred to here is omitted from this latter selection of documents. These two sets will be cited hereafter as *Cartas del Libertador* and *Selected Writings* respectively.

converged to remind me that you were my second father. All my uncles, my brother and sisters, my grandfather, my childhood games, the rewards which you gave me when I was good . . . all thronged in to bring back my earliest emotions . . . the effusion of most tender feelings. . . .⁵

These expressions and his earlier letters reveal a filial devotion to members of his family and show him in accord with the spirit of the fourth commandment of the decalogue, at least when he was thirty-two years old. Since he did not write letters nor have any "Boswell" O'Leary during his first nine years there is no way of proving that he was or was not imbued with Catholicism during that formative period. Long afterwards he insisted that children should, even by law, be made to study their catechism and moral principles. One omission is of considerable significance. Simón has nothing to recall about an occasion memorable to all Catholics, good, bad, and indifferent, namely, his first communion day.

His godfather Esteban was an accountant who, according to the Bolívar of 1825, was "admirable and very honest," had traveled, had sound judgment, but had lost his fortune.⁶ Simón was not much in contact with him through forty years, and his influence can be classified as benign rather than character forming. Family loyalty or sentiment prompted Bolívar to instruct Santander to pay Esteban five thousand pesos and to find him some suitable position. Though this benefice cost Bolívar dearly owing to his very shrunken purse he felt that he owed it to his uncle for whom he claimed to have much affection. Esteban apparently was not up to the task of managing the family estates; for this the legal mind of José Saenz was employed, the same who later recalled many anecdotes about the spoiled child, Simoncito.

Who else could have been in a position to teach Simón principles of religion, or in fact any worthwhile principles before he struck out for himself at fifteen years of age? The only record of any instruction goes into the broad and indefinite category of "private tutoring," informal, elastic hours, far less confining than the classrooms of the old college. Unmentioned by Bolívar, a Father Negrete or Negrette may be the one who taught him his prayers. Father Pedro Palacios y Sojo, another maternal uncle, could by his

⁵ *Cartas del Libertador*, V, 20; *Selected Writings*, II, 514, translates this letter into beautiful English, and adds considerably to the style of Bolívar, and in the last sentence rounds out what Bolívar probably intended to write.

⁶ *Cartas del Libertador*, V, 29.

calling have given some religious instruction, but he was more interested in music. He is credited with introducing that fine art to Caracas in the form of the first wind instruments, long before Simón was born.⁷ Father Pedro is far more famous for having received the first letters of Simón, from Mexico and Spain.⁸ In the third of these Simón thanks his Uncle Pedro for getting his Uncle Estaban out of a jailing occasioned by a financial lawsuit.

In these letters to a priest one might expect to find indications of religious beliefs and expressions of piety, even though Father Pedro seems to have been more devoted to other affairs than his pastoral duties. Simón says nothing about the sacraments of penance or the Eucharist or of attending to his duties in their respect. True, the frequentation of these sacraments by the laity was not then nearly as common as it is now, and one can hardly expect a busy boy of that time to write much about his interior concerns.⁹ No one can prove what he thought during his early years about the practice of religion, but surely in the many trying circumstances of his life one would expect him to mention sometime the Madre de Dios, which he does not. However, an eighteen year old Simón gave reason to suppose that he thought along fundamental Catholic lines. He told his Uncle Pedro that he knew of no one who was more interested in the cause of the poor and miserable than he, in spite of his lack of funds. "My prayers are few, and of little help for their subject, but none the less I shall not stop applying all of them for the happy outcome of the zealous interest which you have had in this affair." Simón went on to express sorrow over the death of his uncle's majordomo and he consoled Father Pedro with the words: "In fine, God is the author of all our successes,

⁷ John E. Baur, "Venezuelan Education During Liberation," *MID-AMERICA*, XXXIII (April, 1951), 105. This article contains much factual data on the state of education in Venezuela and it reveals that Bolívar could have obtained a far better training than he actually chose to get.

⁸ See *Cartas del Libertador*, I, 1-7.

⁹ William Spence Robertson, *The Rise of the Spanish-American Republics As Told in the Lives of their Liberators*, New York and London, 1932, 218, has this to say about Simón's baptismal names, Simón José Antonio de la Santísima Trinidad. "The child probably received the baptismal name 'de la Santísima Trinidad' because his parents were accustomed to worship in a chapel of Caracas which a member of the Bolívar family had dedicated to the worship of the Holy Trinity,—a cult which Simón supported throughout his life." Dr. Robertson's terminology is quite excusable, but it is misleading to non-Catholics. The better reading would be: "... which a member of the Bolívar family had had dedicated to the Holy Trinity,—a devotion which Simón practiced throughout his life." However, I do not find any reason for saying that Simón practiced any devotion either to his patron saints or the Trinity.

so everything should be for our good. This reflection is our consolation when we are in affliction and so it is necessary that you do not now forget it."¹⁰ Nobody can complain about a want of Christianity in these sentences, rare though they be in Simón's writings.

Writing from Arequipa to Vice President Santander on May 20, 1825, Bolívar was very angry with M. de Mollien, who had made some slurring comments in the *Morning Chronicle* about his lack of education.¹¹ The Liberator called the remarks unjust, saying "it is not true that my education was badly neglected, since my mother and family made every possible effort in order that I might have proper instruction." It would have been far truer to have said that all efforts were made to put Simón in the proximate occasion of an education and it would have been far more to the point to have indicated the type of education. An obviously apologetic Bolívar then called the roll of his teachers and listed his studies, thus endearing himself to a host of future students of his life, especially educators of the Dewey tenets.

Among these several molders of his mind he mentions Father Francisco de Andujar, a Capuchin. "Father Andujar, of whom the Baron von Humboldt had a high opinion, created an academy of mathematics especially for me." The fact is that Andujar began to teach Simón, his brother, and a few other boys some mathematics in the house of Simón's grandfather in June, 1798. This was a step in Andujar's program of obtaining a donation toward establishing a school of sciences and mathematics. The classes soon dissolved, but the results have been far-reaching in the field of educational panegyrics. Caracas is now credited with one "academy of mathematics," one school of science, one advanced scientific thinker, praise from the great Von Humboldt, and a Simón with a scientific bent. Yet, as will become clear, the exactness in thinking, promised to students who study sciences and mathematics, was not the outcome of Simón's brief dabbling in these precise disciplines. Neither Andujar's obvious hints nor Rodríguez's pestering could inspire the youthful Simón to set aside part of his fortune as a foundation for scientific investigation and instruments.

Continuing his defense of his education Bolívar remembered two of "the foremost teachers" of his country, Andrés Bello and Simón Carreño, *alias* Simón Rodríguez, *alias* Robinson. Now, An-

¹⁰ *Cartas del Libertador*, I, 7.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, IV, 337; *Selected Writings*, II, 500-502.

drés was just a year and eight months older than his pupil, whom he tried to teach composition and geography. Both were of high school age, consequently, merely because both later became famous, it is rather inane to attribute any great influence on Bolívar's character to Bello. Their later correspondence merely indicates an agreement between the two on some important points of policy.

But this Rodríguez was an influence. He was about twelve years older than Bolívar in years, though far older in the ways of the world. He was a clerk or amanuensis for Simón's grandfather Palacios. If he taught Simón reading and writing in the years when such teaching usually takes place, Rodríguez's reputed wisdom and teaching ability was that of a college freshman or sophomore of our days. Now the placing and development of any twenty year old prospect for a college degree is a problem for educators in these our days of curricular dietetics and therapeutics. Rodríguez *with* such aids would be a doubtful candidate for college, let alone for any tutorial task; *without* any previous direction, without even a fair schooling, without training, in a backward colony one hundred and fifty years ago, he was definitely not a leading scholar or tutor or mold of youth. What smattering of knowledge he enjoyed had been gained by reading the French rationalists and French Revolution writers and hearing the new thought discussed by the local sages.

Nobody attributes a set of principles to Simón Rodríguez. He was no Mr. Chips. He apparently had no standards of morality or ethics, but followed his whims of the moment or those of his charge. He has been called a roustabout, a madman, an idiot, a fop, a roué, a gadabout, and was accused of immorality, amorality, and the lesser faults of weak characters. He contributed nothing to the progress of the society by whose bounty he remained a parasite.¹² He would have been well lost to history if Bolívar had not become great and in a moment of elation written him a famous letter.

There is perhaps no better illustration of the work before the definitive biographer of Bolívar than this letter of January 19, 1824, to Don Simón Rodríguez. It may well be one of the reasons why the Liberator did not wish Santander to publish his correspondence at the time when hero worshippers in Colombia were avid for news of Bolívar and his warfare far to the south and when adula-

¹² The opinions of Rodríguez are as abundant as the writers on Bolívar. They vary only in accidentals and abound in surmises and interpretations.

tion of him was high. The letter has been used often, and misused as often, in that only select passages have been quoted to illustrate one or other point. No one seems to have taken it apart to see of what stuff it was made.

To señor don Simón Rodríguez.

Oh my Master! Oh my friend! Oh my Robinson, you in Colombia! You in Bogotá, and nothing have you told me, nothing have you written. Without doubt you are the most extraordinary man in the world; you may merit other epithets [?] but I do not wish to give them so as not to be discourteous in saluting a guest who comes from the Old World to visit the new; yes, to visit his fatherland, which he now does not know, which he has forgotten, not in his heart but in his memory. No one more than I knows that you cherish our adored Colombia. Do you remember when we went together to Monte Sacro in Rome to swear on that sacred ground the liberty of the fatherland? Certainly you have not forgotten that day of eternal glory for us, a day that anticipated, so to speak, a prophetic oath to the same hope which we could not have.

You, Master mine, how closely must you have watched me though situated at so remote a distance. With what eagerness you must have followed my steps, those steps directed very foreknowingly by you yourself. You formed my heart for liberty, for justice, for greatness, for beauty. I have followed the path which you marked out for me. You were my pilot though sitting on some shore of Europe. Nor can you imagine how deeply carved in my heart are the lessons which you have taught me; nor have I ever been able to blot out even a comma of the great maxims which you have given me. Ever present in my mind's eye I have followed them as infallible guides. In fine, you have seen my conduct; you have seen my written thoughts, my soul painted on paper, and you could not but say to yourself: all that is mine, I sowed this plant, I watered it, I strengthened its weakness, now robust, strong and fruitful, here are its fruits; they are mine, I go to enjoy them in the garden which I planted; I go to enjoy the shade of its friendly branches, for my right is imprescriptible, exclusive of all.

Yes, my beloved friend, you are with us; a thousand times blessed the day on which you trod the shores of Colombia. One more wise man, one more just man, adorns the brow of the proud head of Colombia. I am desperate to know your plans and what destination you have; above all my impatience is fatal not being able to clasp you in my arms; now that I cannot fly to you, come quickly to me; you will lose nothing; you will behold with awe the immense fatherland which you have, carved in the rock from despotism by the victorious swords of the liberators, brothers of yours. No, you will never be filled with the sight of the scenes, of the colossi, of the treasures, of the secrets, of the prodigies which this superb Colombia embraces and contains. Come to Chimborazo; profane with your daring foot the stairway of the titans, the crown of the earth, the impregnable battlement of the new Universe. From this great height you will have a vista; and there viewing the heavens and the earth, admiring the grandeur of the earthly creation you will say: two eternities

are spread before me: the past and the future; this throne of nature, identical with its author, will be as enduring, indestructible and eternal as the Father of the Universe.

From what other place indeed could you say as much and as proudly? Friend of nature, come to look into its age, its life, its primitive essence; you have not seen in that weary old world more than the relics and rubbish of the provident Mother Earth: there she is bent with the weight of years, of infirmities and of the pestiferous breath of men; here she is maiden, immaculate, beautiful, adorned by the very hand of the Creator. No, the profane touch of man has in no wise withered her divine attractions, her marvelous graces, her chaste virtues.

Friend, if such irresistible attractions do not drive you to a speedy flight to me, I shall have recourse to a stronger appeal: I invoke friendship.

Present this letter to the Vice President, ask him for money in my name, and come to join me.¹³

Just what can be said about such a letter? What kind of character does it reveal? Is it to be taken seriously in its entirety or only in part? The man writing it, we recall, is forty years old, yet much of the letter is childish. It is well enough to explain or excuse the effort by calling it "typically Latin," effusive, a fine sample of Bolívar's expansive soul, or a notable instance of his emotional stress or unbounded elation. On the other hand one could quite as easily say that the writer was ill with a fever or in his cups or effected by a high altitude. Consequently, anyone may interpret its meaning to suit himself, and therefore it reveals a lack of straightforward, honest expression.

The first paragraph, supposing the amanuensis has not thrown in the confusing words, is practically incoherent. Rodríguez is at once a guest and a Colombian patriot; he merits epithets, meaning praises probably, but such would be discourteous; he has forgotten Colombia, according to one translator, not only in his heart but in his memory, but still cherishes it. And confusion reigns in the last

¹³ *Cartas del Libertador*, IV, 32-34; *Selected Writings*, II, 424-425; the latter translation is far more polished than that presented here. This opinion of Rodríguez and his influence may be compared with that given twenty years previously in the much disputed "Letter attributed to Bolívar," in *Cartas de Libertador* I, 12-15. If this is to be believed Rodríguez was attempting to dissuade Bolívar from his frivolous ways of life and wanted him to invest his money in apparatus for sciences. Bolívar remarks about the very persuasive Rodríguez using most absurd sophisms for arguments. He calls him "this capricious man, without order in his own affairs, who involved himself with everybody and paid nobody, many times reduced to wanting the necessities of life; this man had charge of the fortune which my father left me . . . and augmented it by a third." Rodríguez did not approve of Simón's use of his fortune. But, according to the letter, all that was over for Simón; he was leaving Rodríguez for Paris. How much of this one may believe is not certain.

sentence. If Rodríguez could understand what Bolívar intended, they were indeed kindred souls. The next paragraphs are a noteworthy example of self-adulation and grandiose flourish, an apostrophe like an exercise in rhetoric. If taken at their face value they reveal a supreme vanity, as though the writer were merely using this letter form as a vehicle for praising his achievement. Is it poetic fancy, or is Simón expressing his sense of humor? Sane or nonsane the letter has established Rodríguez as a philosopher and tutor of the great Bolívar.

Bolívar himself has about the best characterization of his own thinking and writing. De Mollien had said that he was diffuse. "He could better say that I am not correct, since actually I am not because I am impetuous, careless, and impatient: I do not know how an impatient and impetuous man can be wordy. I multiply many ideas in very few words, though without order or agreement [coherence.]"¹⁴ There is no doubt about his verbosity nor about his impressionistic thinking, his inability to clarify his ideas, or, to put it briefly, his undisciplined habits of mind.

To return to the character building days, we find writers invariably mentioning Simón as developing into some say a headstrong, spoiled, sensitive, uncontrollable lad, while others say a strong-willed, vigorous, independent thinker. Rodríguez was not of a character to gainsay his charge in anything, to the jeopardy of his tutorial fee, and apparently let the boy have his way. Bolívar in the above mentioned defence of his early education says that when he was very young, perhaps too young he was given lessons in the arts of fencing, dancing, and horsemanship, and there is no doubt about his proficiency in these. When he was fourteen he had some training as a cadet in the militia, the power and might of which can best be estimated by the fact that in a year young Bolívar, three weeks before he was fifteen, was made an ensign.¹⁵

In summary of his first fifteen years educational progress there is very little to say. He learned his prayers, learned a large, studied handwriting, made mistakes in spelling, grammar, and composition, made ink blots on the paper, and scratched out letters like an average first high student. To say that he had any great knowledge of Rousseau, Voltaire and Montesquieu is to put him beyond his intelligence, but to say that he did not take to the idea of Rousseau's original man and freedom from restraint would prob-

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, IV, 338.

¹⁵ Robertson, *Rise*, 219, says the royal order was issued on July 4, 1798, for the sixth company of the Aragua militia.

ably be wrong. As for his religious practices and moral principles the field of surmise is open, and the probability is that he was no better trained in these respects than he was in other informal studies.

III. European Training

Time came for his Palacios uncles and his legal guardian to see to his future. His Uncle Esteban was in Madrid with court connections and the ambitious Creoles saw opportunities for their wealthy nephew. When he was fifteen years and a half of age he and another Venezuelan, Esteban Escobar, set sail for Spain. The ship left La Guaira on January 19, 1799, and reached Mexico's port of entry, Vera Cruz, on February 2, "thanks to God," he said. The port was blockaded by the British, so Simón journeyed up to Mexico City. There he saw the bishop about some of his Uncle Pedro's business and the viceroy for visas. Later, someone started the legend that he stood before the viceroy and gave him a few ideas on liberalizing the government. Back in Vera Cruz he embarked for Havana and Spain on March 20. He disembarked at Santona in Spain on May 31, 1799. Before he was sixteen he was in his Madrid lodging, the home of Marqués de Ustáriz, a gentleman from Caracas who had become a noble. Apparently his Uncle Esteban had conducted him first to his own lodgings, which were in the house of the Queen's favorite, Manuel Mallo, a notorious South American. If this is true, as O'Leary says, the place was a source of scandal to young Bolívar. The why and when of Esteban's jailing need not concern us.

The second phase of Bolívar's education began with his arrival in Madrid. The facts pertaining to his training are meagre and for want of data writers have digressed into descriptions of the hideous condition of the Spanish court and administration, while their documentary data depends upon what Bolívar wrote or remembered to tell O'Leary many years later. A little reasoning brings out some very cold, hard conclusions. Bolívar for the first time went to school, that is, went to a class for formal instruction. And, contrary to what is often said, here in a hotbed of absolutism, he was not grounded in the revolutionary thought nor did he here get his unassorted lot of political ideas. There is no mention of any religious or moral practices, nor on the other hand of any rebellion against authority in any of its established forms. However, numerous factors were conspiring to aid in the change that was later

to come: his undisciplined mind, his immaturity, the want of anyone to whom he was responsible, the whirl of European life, the nasty conditions of the court, the war times of Napoleon, indifferentism to laws, the social and economic upset, and the rationalist and revolutionary publications. Clear and penetrating thinking was next to impossible in the ferment and the low status of education in Spain was no aid to the development of a rounded character, especially when the highest form of training there, philosophy and law were studiously avoided by Simón.

Here are some cold facts which an educator might wish to consider. Bolívar arrived in Spain on May 31, 1799, at the age of fifteen years and ten months, high school age. On September 30, 1800, he announced to his Uncle Pedro that he was engaged to marry Teresa Toro, so we must assume that his studies suffered a little during his courtship days previous to that time. He was then seventeen years and two months old. Teresa's family then moved two hundred miles north to Bilbao. Bolívar was in Bilbao on August 23 and December 29, 1801, and whether he made two trips or remained the whole of the five months makes little difference, for it was time lost to studies. At the beginning of 1802 he went to Paris, which plainly required some time. On May 26, 1802, he was back in Madrid marrying Teresa. He was then eighteen years and ten months old. He had spent just three years in Spain, before the pair left for Caracas. There on January 22, 1803, Teresa died of yellow fever, when Bolívar was nineteen and a half years old and was finished with his education.

Scanning the records for a sufficient number of credits for possible entry into college, if Bolívar had ever intended such a step, reveals an odd curriculum for the two, at the most, years when he might have been studying. He continued his lessons in fencing, dancing and horsemanship. He added long walks to his physical education program. He went to classes in mathematics in the Academia de Bellas Arts de San Fernando. Though he wrote at the time after a year in Spain that he had only one tutor in foreign languages, the Marqués de Ustáriz, he said in 1825 that Ustáriz directed select masters who tutored him.¹⁶ In 1825 in his apology for his education he told Santander very confidentially, lest Santander think he was badly educated:

Certainly I did not learn either the philosophy of Aristotle nor the codes of crime and error; but it could be that Mr. de Mollien has not

¹⁶ *Cartas del Libertador*, I, 5, and IV, 337.

studied as much as I Locke, Condillac, Buffon, Dalambert, Helvetius, Montesquieu, Mably, Filangieri, Lalande, Rousseau, Voltaire, Rollin, Berthot and all the classics of antiquity, as well as philosophers, historians, orators and poets; and all the modern classics of Spain, France, Italy and a large part of the English.¹⁷

Incredible though this statement is, exponents of the Bolívar thesis of greatness not only accept it but embellish it, even to the point of attributing this vast amount of reading to a boy in Caracas who could not write his Spanish well at the age of fifteen. He assuredly could not have completed this reading program in his years in Spain while learning foreign languages and engaging in the various non-academic affairs indicated above and those not indicated—his social life with courtiers and others. The Marqués, it must be remembered, was not a Spanish educator; he was a Venezuelan, and a courtier, and moreover had no great responsibility for Bolívar's training, beyond seeing that he did not violate the court codes of etiquette. Rumor had it, and the bills for clothing for Simón are confirmation, that the young man spent much time with the tailors.

The sum total of Bolívar's formal education to his twentieth birthday was "some classes," (not courses) in mathematics. No more followed in after years.

The sum total of Bolívar's hours under the tutorship of several not highly qualified instructors is open to dispute. There is no record of the time spent nor of the content of the instruction, secular or religious.

The hours spent in private reading during these first twenty years may well be questioned, with respect to the quantity and with respect to the ability of Bolívar to read intelligently. Possibly some of this reading was done and notes taken during this period. More likely the reading was done, if it was done, afterwards. There is no doubt from Bolívar's writings that he quoted the sayings of a number of writers of the past, but this could have been done without his ever having seen copy of their works, since they had been quoted for two centuries in Latin America and in European authors. So also could he have read excerpts in Europe and in Venezuela from the writings of the new, rationalist thinkers whom he cited. In other words, because he was the great Bolívar therefore he must also be a great thinker, and because he was a

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, IV, 338.

great thinker he must have read widely and deeply. The reasoning is fallacious and unsubstantiated.

Bolívar was stunned by the death of his wife. His devotion to her was complete, as is abundantly testified to by his biographers. Her passing was a tragedy in more ways than one. The last of the stabilizing influences in his life was gone. He had just taken up the responsibilities of manhood, had planned a home and heirs to perpetuate his fortune and name. Thenceforward he was homeless, without successors, and ultimately without his fortune.

For reasons best known to himself he settled his financial affairs and departed for Europe in the autumn of 1803. He landed at Cádiz, went to Madrid, Bilbao, and Paris, where he arrived in 1804. From then until his return to Venezuela in February 1807, when he was nearing twenty-four years of age, he created numerous problems for historians. The dispute is concerned with the general question: Was he a rake and spendthrift? Several letters attributed to him and some of his later sayings and remarks to O'Leary give rise to the dispute, and until such time as someone proves these documentary materials to be authentic the arguments must continue. Some will say that he suffered a complete letdown of moral restraints and followed the ways of the prodigal, and others will say that he began to be seriously concerned with his purpose in life, improved himself by reading, discussion, and travel. There is a third possibility, namely that he combined these various aims and activities to suit his own pleasure, making up his own rules as he went along.

The general question incorporates several other particular subjects for dispute, since they arise out of the untrustworthiness of the documents. Chief among these several is the letter "attributed to Bolívar" and written to Madame Dervieu du Villars, familiarly known as Fanny. The best that can be said about this is that if its author was Bolívar he was running a high fever, yet many quote its contents and deduce from its words that Bolívar was a changed man, for the worse. Then there is dispute about his affairs with Rodríguez, financial and gambling, and even about the fact they ever made a vow to liberate their country. Most of his biographers describe Bolívar as handsome, well dressed, and a ladies man. This gives ample opportunity for adding spice to a book and adding to its publisher appeal, but actually there is very little known about the comings and goings of the biographee. Another point in doubt is his adoption of the Napoleonic ideas, or his catching at

least a mild case of megalomania in both its military and political aspects from this supreme egotist.

He is shown in all this as a man of no solid character. Basic to this picture of Simón was his attitude toward religion and ethics. Can it be said that because there is no mention of his religious practice or beliefs he had given up the faith of his forefathers? There is no documentary evidence to prove conclusively what interior convictions he had. Who knew his thoughts at the time? Who can be certain of what was said years later by himself, by O'Leary, old Rodríguez, and other memoir composers? As for judgment of his external actions, there are instances of his disagreement with the thought and practice of Mother Church.

The accusation against him of his cuckolding the oldish husband of Fanny arouses debate. Some deny this affair on the score that she was a cousin of his. Others recalling his later boasts of his European conquests to O'Leary and observing his American amours have no doubt of his guilt. There seems no doubt about his philanderings. Expected and tolerated in a perennially scandalous court society they were nevertheless morally wrong, to the ultimate consequence that the children of the schools of Latin America to this day do not have before them a model of moral sobriety in their Liberator.

It has been positively asserted that Bolívar was a deist. This gratuitous charge, or praise where liberal writers are concerned, stems from several facts and illogical conclusions. Bolívar became a Freemason in Paris, he was republican in opinion, and he used deistic cant in his later writings. Therefore he must have been a deist. Moreover, he is said to have refused to attend the services in the Cathedral of Notre Dame whereat Napoleon, assisted by Pope Pius VII, crowned himself Emperor of the French; and in the following year he refused to kiss the cross on the Pope's sandal.

Bolívar did become a Mason, and, when it suited his purposes rather than because the Catholic Church forbade participation, he repudiated his affiliation.¹⁸ Deism is probably the most vague and most indefinite word in the dictionary. A deist may be one

¹⁸ *Selected Writings*, II, 546: "The Devil take the Masons and all such philosophic charlatans." Thus wrote Bolívar on October 21, 1825, to Santander. Bolívar here explains that the Masons had been favorable to him because he flattered them. At that moment of victory he was at the same time against the "crows" as he called the conservative Catholic priests. More will be said about his affiliation with the lodges later in this paper.

who believes in God, or in a God, or in no God, or in God as he wishes God to be. Anyone may be called a deist, if judged by one or several expressions. But there is no block of evidence proving that Bolívar denied the traditional teaching of the Catholic religion, much as his actions may have violated its code. Certainly, one can scarcely credit a mind as upset and untrained as Bolívar's to have considered long the intricate ramifications of the wide varieties of deistic thought. In the simple sense that he was a Mason, was a freethinker, was opposed to clerical control, and was a law unto himself, he might qualify vaguely as a vague deist.

About this business of Napoleon's in Notre Dame, O'Leary says that Bolívar refused to go to the crowning services; Bolívar says he attended and was thrilled. The solution can be attended to by some other writer. So also, there is much confusion with reference to the story of Simón's meeting with the Pope. The tale is told by O'Leary years after it is supposed to have happened.¹⁹ It would illustrate Bolívar's fearless independence; but it would likewise illustrate his inconsistency and boorishness. The Spanish Ambassador presented Bolívar to Pius VII. In the audience Bolívar refused to kiss the cross on the papal sandal. The Pope then extended his ring, which Bolívar likewise refused, saying (then or later) words to the effect that the Pope holds the symbol of Christianity of no value if he wears it on his sandals while proud princes wear it in their crowns. Why should one in such a frame of mind even bother about an audience with the Pope? Why quibble about the symbol of Christianity in the presence of the Vicar of Christ? Why enlarge the stature of a definitely insignificant young Bolívar at the expense of an important world leader?

Bolívar left Paris, toured France with Rodríguez to Italy in the spring of 1805, and made his famed vow on Monte Aventino on August 15. Then he went to Naples to inspect Vesuvius with Baron von Humboldt and Gay Lussac. The meetings with these savants later were to add much to his intellectual prestige. He left Rodríguez in Italy and returned to Paris. There he heard of the Miranda expedition to liberate Venezuela. At the end of 1806 he sailed for Boston, then continued quickly to New York, Philadelphia and Charleston, which tour gave him later an opportunity to assess the people and constitutional ways of the United States. He was back in Venezuela in February, 1807, five months short of his twenty-fourth birthday anniversary.

¹⁹ Daniel Florencio O'Leary, *Memorias del General O'Leary*, 32 Volumes, Caracas, 1879-1888, I, 23.

What progress had he made in knowledge and wisdom during his four years travel? You have your choice of the disputed opinions. Surely he could not have been gambling and philandering, with some days of illness unaccounted for, and at the same time have done the vast reading attributed to him. Possibly he did have the resolution to liberate his country, either as an idealist or patriot or as an egoist seeking fame. If so the driving force of freedom and fame was not owing to education nor to his vast reading nor to his tutors. The desire for freedom and for fame are rather common human aspirations. Driving force is not common, especially such as Bolívar later exposed. What Bolívar may have acquired in his travels was a confidence in himself, a confidence in himself as a man of destiny, and a spirit that no law should confine him. He may have felt the stirring of that ruthlessness by which he was to attain his goal. This spirit has been otherwise stated as a passionate urging to free his country.

IV. Patriot?

One would be very hard pressed to prove that Bolívar on his return to Venezuela was consumed with a fever to break away from Spain. Nevertheless, this has been written and is commonly supposed to be the case. The promoters of his cause seem to be unaware that for the five years or more after his vow and promise to Fanny the documentary evidence about him is very scant. The three years from February, 1807, to April, 1810, are painful to many unobjective writers, who frequently fill in pages with discussions of the deeds of Miranda, Napoleon, and other important leaders in Europe and in America. But years ago Professor Robertson dated the time at which Bolívar "dedicated himself to the task of liberating his native land from Spanish domination."²⁰ This was when he realized that Monteverde in violation of the treaty of San Mateo, July 25, 1812, had confiscated his money and estates.

A simple narration of the known facts should prove the background for a character portrayal of Bolívar far different from that painted later. During 1807 he was out in the Valley of Yare managing his estates, as four short letters on financial doings and one on his lawsuit with Briceño testify. Most probably he remained there during the first half of 1808. In the beginning of 1808 Na-

²⁰ Robertson, *Rise*, 223.

oleon occupied Spain and on May 5, 1808, forced the abdication of Ferdinand VII. News of this reached Venezuela on July 15, with the arrival of Napoleon's agents at La Guayra. The agents after announcing that Joseph Bonaparte was King of Spain slipped away from the port. By September the underground in Spain was organized in favor of Ferdinand VII and its agents were generally received in the Spanish colonies. In October, 1808, Bolívar was in Caracas, for he made out a receipt to his Uncle Pedro, who paid back half of a fifteen hundred peso loan. In November the citizens of Caracas led by Captain-General Juan de las Casas had up a petition to the underground Spanish regency asking it to authorize the Caracas junta as the government in the name of Ferdinand VII with the right to send representatives of the colony to the Spanish anti-Napoleon assembly. Bolívar did not sign this petition. Therefore, it has been guessed, he must have been against Ferdinand VI and the regency and the Spanish cortes. He could not have been absent, of course, or ill, or undecided. The main fear was that Napoleonic troops would soon be in Caracas.

In 1809 he was named Teniente of the Valley of Yare by the Captain-General and took his oath to fulfill the duties of his office, but because he was ill he sent a deputy to the meetings of the cabildo. He wrote a protest on August 1 when his deputy was refused a seat. Not much more is known of Simón's deeds during this year. In 1810 Napoleon's troops enveloped Spain, cutting off the colonies by garrisoning the ports, especially Cádiz. When this bad news reached Caracas and its effects on the trade of the Creole producers became apparent a famous meeting was called. On April 19, with the fear of the arrival of the French over them, the leaders of the Cabildo forced the resignation of the Captain-General and established themselves as the governing body under the title of "The Supreme Committee for the Preservation of the Rights of Ferdinand VII."

This Junta appears now to the Venezuelans to have been a republic, since it provided for free trade, set up administrative officers, and established foreign relations. However, the vast majority of people of the time did not have this concept of a new order come to deliver them. The Junta sent Bolívar, Luis López Méndez and Andrés Bello, secretary, to England where they were in July, 1810. As commissioners they solemnly assured His Britannic Majesty that their government was far from any desire to sever with Spain. "Although independent of the Council of the

Regency [in Spain] Venezuela neither regards herself as less faithful to her Monarch nor less concerned with the favorable outcome of Spain's holy struggle."²¹ They wanted from Britain the aid of her fleet as a protection against France and as protection against Venezuelan provinces who were backing the regency; and they wanted trade relations with the British.

The move was somewhat clever; if the British had accepted they would have admitted the existence of the new government, admitted the control of the Caracas Creoles against the claims of the Regency adherents, and would have denied the Council of the Regency in Spain recognition. Wellesley, of course, found it impossible to accede. Venezuelans were definitely not united, and the possibility of a civil war was apparent. Bolívar obtained out of his journey to London from June to his return on December 5 some ideas of the British form of government, about which he talked later as an authority, and some contact with tradesmen. And, by far most important of all, he came to know Miranda and his ideas.

In view of what has been said in the preceding pages of Bolívar's small education this writer would call his meeting with Miranda the turning point of his career. Robertson has pointed out Francisco's influence upon Simón and the manner in which the widely experienced and widely read Miranda took care of the young and incompetent commissioners. "The exile undoubtedly took the impressionable Bolívar to the top of a high mountain and showed him the promised land."²² We would go beyond this to say that Miranda gave Bolívar nearly all of his revolutionary ideas and principles. By his own captivating manner of talking and by his fund of knowledge he rather than Rodríguez former Bolívar. It could be proved fairly well that Bolívar actually aped the Precursor in his actions, speeches, and political ideas. Bolívar claimed the fruits of Miranda's long planting, took over the torch Miranda had been carrying, and built his fabulous reputation at the expense of all Miranda's repute.

Bolívar took pride in bringing back to Venezuela a man so renowned in Europe as the revolutionary Miranda. Already the Junta had sent out a force to take cities which would not join Caracas, or, to put it in Caracan terms, which were favorable to Spain. The force was almost destroyed at Coro. Miranda came

²¹ *Selected Writings*, I, 3.

²² Robertson, *Life of Miranda*, II, 85, 250.

at a dark moment, and the Junta chose him as general of its troops. This was revolt, since Miranda was proscribed, an enemy of Spain, and republican. It was Miranda who drove the congress to its declaration of independence on July 5, 1811. The day before Bolívar first spoke out to a patriotic society in favor of independence, an address of little more than two hundred words.²³

It is altogether misleading to bring the names of Miranda and Bolívar together and to make them appear as equals during this period. Generalísimo Miranda was the brain and the inspiring force of the campaign to unify all the provinces of Venezuela. He considered Bolívar a dangerous gamble, "joven peligroso," in the campaign and wished to discharge him from active service.²⁴ Grudgingly he gave in to the war board when Bolívar protested and without much confidence in Colonel Bolívar assigned him to lead one of the columns attacking Valencia. From Bolívar's very brief military training and untried qualities of leadership it would seem that Miranda was correct, yet he has been upbraided for not recognizing and even thwarting the budding military genius. Miranda directed the attack on Valencia and took the town on August 13, 1811. He cited Bolívar for distinguished service.

Venezuela was a land of chaos during the remainder of 1811. The Caracas patriots could not collect revenues from other provinces and could not train and support an army, consequently the civil war dragged. People were of all shades of political opinion, but were divided into two general groups: those who for their own reasons thought it better to stand by Spain and those who followed Miranda. The former were classified by the latter as royalists, who looked for the protection of their interests to Monteverde. If a vote were taken they would have won the election by a large majority.

On March 6, 1812, the much described earthquake ruined Caracas and four other towns held by the revolutionaries, and left the royalist strongholds practically untouched. Twenty-five to thirty thousand people perished, a third of the number in Caracas. The panic-stricken people prayed and confessed in the ruins and desolation. Not so Bolívar. The story has it that he worked to save those caught in the wrecked buildings, until he reached the plaza.

²³ *Selected Writings*, I, 5.

²⁴ Vincente Lecuna, *Crónica Razonada de las Guerras de Bolívar*, New York, 1950, I, xvii. This three volume set, distributed by the Bank of Venezuela, is a noteworthy contribution to the Bolívar library by the great student of Bolívar.

There a friar was preaching from a pile of rubble, exhorting all to repent and proclaiming that the catastrophe was a punishment of God visited upon the city for revolting against the king. Bolívar pushed him aside, spoke forth to calm the multitude, and thundered: "If nature opposes our plans, we will fight against it until it obeys us." It would seem from the various dramatic description that nature had deliberately set a scene of tremendous Greek tragedy proportions so that the hero might speak his part. Writers have smiled at or ridiculed the credulity and fanaticism of the cowering, superstitious, anti-revolutionary populace—that is, writers who were not there experiencing what must have seemed like the end of the world. Perhaps Bolívar was as awe-struck as others,²⁵ but his panegyrists have done him no permanent good by exploiting his bravado at the expense of the thousands of grief-torn Venezuelans and their beliefs. After all, what did the Caracan leaders have to offer? Why should the people have marched into a future based upon some muddled and untried political theories behind self-appointed leaders whose past records invited no confidence in a better future?

The earthquake ended the republic, the constitution, and the possibility of any successful military operations on the part of the Caracans. The congress soon made Miranda dictator with all powers over the treasury and troops to defend the government. Part of his defense program was to occupy the seaport Puerto Cabello. To this post he sent Bolívar to replace Colonel Ayala. On May 4, 1812, the new Commandment took charge. Monteverde, a former ship captain, moved east from Coro. On July 1 Bolívar was asking help from Miranda against the oncoming force of 2,000 royalists, despite his strongly fortified position. His apologists are extremely hard put to defend his inability to organize his troops. On July 12 the Commandant was back in Caracas writing to Miranda and giving the reasons for his surrender of Puerto Cabello. It was a sad letter.²⁶

²⁵ *Cartas del Libertador*, I, 32 and *Selected Letters*, I, 15, from O'Leary, XIII, 57. In this letter to the Congress of New Granada, written from Cartagena, November 27, 1812, Bolívar states that the consternation over the terrible event was only secondary among the causes leading to "the annihilation of our liberty and independence." Very culpable political errors committed by the government, which he points out, were the prime cause. What should have been used on the people was force, rather than a mere announcement of the new principles.

²⁶ It should be read for an understanding of how he excuses himself for the failure and appeals to the sympathy of Miranda. It is in *Selected Writings*, I, 11-12, and *Cartas del Libertador*, I, 24-25; the latter

Bolívar, concerned mostly with himself, his humiliation, and his defense mechanisms, does not seem to have realized the fatal blow which had been administered to Miranda's campaign by his loss of the port. On that same July 12 Miranda called together the National Executive Power to consider the disaster.²⁷ The port, he said, was lost and there could be no hope of foreign aid. Monteverde had had no arms to prosecute a war, but now he had taken 40,000 pounds of powder and 3,000 muskets and plenty of lead. Miranda suggested an armistice and surrender at the best terms available to avoid bloodshed. All accepted, and so the plans for the treaty of San Mateo went on through the remainder of July. On July 28 the general gave the order to disband all troops. On July 30 he moved to La Guaira to escape on a British ship. On July 31 Monteverde moved into Caracas. At three o'clock the following morning the Bolívar coterie arrested Miranda and turned him and his leaders over to Monteverde. As a result of this action Casas, Peña and Bolívar were not arrested but given passports for foreign countries. Miranda began his prison life which ended with his death, July 14, 1816.

Professor Robertson brands this betrayal of Miranda as a "foul deed" and holds the three men responsible for it.²⁸ His clear verdict, like his judgment on Miranda, is as objective as possible; well-weighed it must stand, despite the many justifications, excuses, and palliations of the Liberator's unethical conduct. The title Liberator is used advisedly, because justifications began only after he had become prominent and untoward facts such as this called for some clearing of his name.

From the viewpoint of principles we may add to Robertson's remarks. Bolívar saved his own skin at the expense of the liberty and life of his leader; he followed the principle of expediency, as a prophet might have foretold from the story of his training. He is reported to have boasted to his dying day of his feat of arresting a traitor; if this is so, he perpetuated a defamation to his own advantage. He is reported to have been on the point of killing Miranda, when the others interposed; if this is true, he was

has a second letter written two days later expressing how disgraced but how unblameworthy he feels.

²⁷ Robertson, *Life of Miranda*, II, 169, but please read from page 164. In these excellent pages of Chapters XXI and XXII the characters of Miranda and Bolívar are delineated and their divergences are shown in their deeds. Miranda was actually trying to avoid fratricidal bloodshed; Bolívar is a convert to the policy of the sword for the dissentients and "might makes right."

²⁸ *Ibid.*, II, 183.

at heart a murderer, who had made himself the law, the judge, the jury, and the executioner. Even by the rule of caudilloism he violated the prime article of obedience to the leader. As an army man he violated the military code by his plotting and as a subaltern by his deliverance of his general to the enemy. The government to which he adhered still existed, though it was on the run; if he recognized its authority, he is culpable of deliberately betraying it to the enemy; if he did not recognize its existence he had already turned traitor to it. Bolívar's authority within any law was nil; he played along with Casas who had two possible sources of authority to make the arrest, either that conferred by Miranda's republic, or that residing in his office from pre-revolutionary days as granted by Spain. By using either authority the Bolívar coterie obviously became a traitor to the opposite cause. Traitors to Spain, they arrested a traitor to Spain, not to their own party. Therefore, this was indeed a "foul deed" devoid of all principle and unchristian in all its aspects.

V. Military Dictator

The summary of Bolívar's positive achievement at this time, his twenty-ninth birthday, clearly amounts to nothing.

He was now a man without a country, a man outside the law. He was without friends. He soon found that he was without money, and this is a cardinal point. When he arrived in Curaçao on September 7, 1812, he discovered that his baggage was impounded. He wrote two letters to Francisco Iturbe, his royalist go-between in Caracas.²⁹ These two letters should be read and studied carefully. They are not just requests for funds and a granting of a power of attorney for the management of his estates. They are cries of despair from a youth who always had had money and who without it now began "to regard life with the greatest disgust and horror." He said that he had some friends but their friendship did not extend to lending him money. He feared that all his houses and rents would be confiscated. He debases himself before a royalist—for his money—calling him friend and master and flattering him in no few sentences. He is a victim of circumstances and anything said against him is not to be believed. His conscience is at peace. He is resolute as all men of honor and

²⁹ *Selected Letters*, I, 12-14.

courage. He asks: "What does it matter if one has or has not the material things of life?" Then he concludes by begging for enough to keep himself alive until the reply comes.

He finally obtained a loan of a thousand pesos in October. Then he learned of the confiscation of his properties in November. It was under these circumstances that he decided to "adopt" New Granada to get the aid necessary to "redeem Venezuela," but, as was stated before, the prime motive appears to have been to redeem his estates. The idea of going to New Granada for the purpose of liberating that area before Venezuela was Miranda's, not Bolívar's. Moreover, it was put into effect first by the Venezuelans who had fled the wrath of Monteverde and made their way to Cartagena. They had already organized several columns of militia totaling nearly a thousand men and were out taking the towns of the province of Cartagena with the intention of reaching Santa Marta, and thus hold both ports of New Granada. After these Venezuelan exiles had joined forces with the Cartagenans Bolívar appeared on the scene.

There is no reason to suppose that leaders of the revolt in Cartagena welcomed Bolívar with open arms, but there are reasons to say the opposite. He did get a small command. Then on November 2, 1812, came word of the signing of Miranda's capitulation and of Monteverde's taking properties of the rebels against the terms of the treaty. Bolívar took pen in hand and under date of November 27, 1812, revealed his ire. He wrote to the distinguished gentlemen of the Congress of New Granada, and signed it as, of all things, "Colonel of the Army and Commandant of Puerto Cabello"!

He explained why Caracas fell. Political errors of the republic were the cause. The Caracans should have attacked the vile city of Coro and forced it into the union rather than try to lead it in a benevolent (and democratic) way into the fold. Here is your dictator mind. So too, men should have been forced into the army. The stupid Spanish were not punished for their atrocious crimes. "And lastly, the religious fanaticism, hypocritically managed by the clergy, was attempting to distort the public spirit to its own views of egoism and party interest, fearing the loss of its dominance over the superstitious people."³⁰ Then, in the congress there were turbulent spirits seeking control for their own localities. Thus, everybody was to blame except Bolívar, who says that he

³⁰ *Cartas del Libertador*, I, 33; *Selected Writings*, I, 16.

miraculously escaped from the clutches of raging, beastly, cruel, Spanish tyrants to warn the New Granadans and to implore their aid to vindicate Caracas, etc. The letter is a veiled vindication of Bolívar and an indication to the New Granada congress that a flaming son of liberty was in the land.

Bolívar then amplified this letter and had it printed in pamphlet form to be distributed among the citizens of New Granada.³¹ In his pamphlet he inveighs against federalism and argues for a highly centralized government. He begs the Granadans to march into Venezuela before the great influx of Spanish exiles, about to be driven out of Spain, arrives in Caracas. He feared the arrival especially of cardinals, archbishops, bishops, canons, and revolutionary clerics who would come to subvert the new states and bring about a frightful world anarchy. No one can stop them from coming to America, and Napoleon would soon drive them out. Now is the time to raise armies, strengthen the ports, and prevent this disaster. Thousands will join us if we but enter Venezuela, avenge the martyrs, and save especially the deserving people of Caracas. This last sentence had been said years before by Miranda. The sincerity of the pamphlet can well be doubted in view of Bolívar's desire to recover his properties. It is obviously wild and filled with exaggeration, but it probably served the purpose of bringing him before the public as someone of importance. He was using the typical method of politicians to add to his size by attacking the biggest and most important institutions. His broadside against the clergy did him more harm than good, for it placed him in a class with the radicals in the Spanish cortes who were announcing their constitution at the time.

There are a few facts for the years 1813 and 1814 which must be mentioned, principally because they have been so distorted and have been made to redound to the glory of Bolívar. They pertain to his "brilliant" campaign. He was allowed to keep his rank as colonel by the revolutionaries in Cartagena. He had under him an "army" of seventy men as a garrison at Barranca. He was subaltern to Labatut, a French soldier of fortune. His higher superior was Brigadier Manuel del Castillo. Bolívar began to move about taking small town and gathering grain and supplies. Very

³¹ *Ibid.*, I, 18-26; *Cartas del Libertador*, 1, 35-46. This Memorial is dated December 15, 1812, but was not printed until 1813. It is the first of Bolívar's long list of pronouncements. What help he had in its composition and in the editorial office is not known. It awaits an objective, critical analysis.

soon Castillo charged him with disobeying orders, and, from the appearance of things, not rendering a full account of materials collected. Thenceforward the two were enemies, and the Granadan congress soon had to divide the command. Bolívar became General of the Northern Army.³² He now had 488 men under his command.

After adding some important people to his army he began his famous march through villages eastward to Caracas, one "victory" after another to Caracas. He entered the town August 7, 1813, amid noisy acclaim in a carriage drawn by beautiful daughters of Caracas. More important than this as an illustration of his character was his notorious Proclamation of June 15, entitled: SIMON BOLIVAR, Liberator of Venezuela, Brigadier of the Union, General in Chief of the Northern Army, to his fellow-countrymen."³³ In this bombastic outburst he announced his "war to the death" on everybody who did not join and aid his cause. If Spaniards and Canary Islanders remained neutral, they were to be killed. There were no longer two sides to the question, no neutral position. All had to engage actively in the cause.

To those who may still think that Bolívar was a great man it is necessary to point out the similarity between his ideas and those recently condemned in Hitler. Here was a peculiar type of liberation. People were free to act only according to the wishes of the Liberator. Even Bolívar's stout defenders see something wrong in the idea of war to the death. They explain that his program was one of military necessity, forgetting however that the military necessity was designed by Bolívar to establish himself as dictator, which he promptly did. It was this type of mentality that has done irreparable harm to progress in Latin America, just as it did in the times of Bolívar, who himself became a victim at the hands of followers of his thought.

Bolívar wrote the glorious news to the congress of New Granada. He then dictated a program to Archbishop Narciso Coll y Prat. The letter is a monument to the colossal egotism of the thirty-year old dictator, full of the heady wine of his recent suc-

³² See the contemporary note in the margin of Bolívar's letter to the Secretary of State of the Government of the Union (of New Granada), in *Selected Letters*, I, 30, on the critical condition which Bolívar had brought about. This may be one of the reasons why the Granadans were glad to let him go where he wished, to Caracas.

³³ *Selected Letters*, I, 31, and many other places in part or in whole.

cess.³⁴ This is not merely a statement of Bolívar's anti-clericalism. It is a revelation of his utter lack of knowledge of the Catholic faith, or, if he was aware of his words on confession, it is an indication of anti-Catholicism as well as anti-Clericalism. He accuses the clergy of undermining the revolutionary program in the confessional, and wants the Archbishop to suspend any priest who would absolve enemies to his program! This is the *meaning* of the letter! In plain words, what Bolívar demanded was that the sacrament of penance should be used to force people to agree with him: give absolution to those who were in favor of his republic and refuse it to those who were not! And this of course reeks with stupidity.

Glance at the logical consequences. If patriots alone were to be absolved, Bolívar was the greatest of the patriots. He should be absolved—nay, canonized—immediately. This is not facetious, for the idea was taken up by at least seventeen later dictators in Latin America, who went so far as to establish their own religion after the manner of Henry VIII, or Bolívar if they ever heard of him, and placed themselves over the consciences of a fearing populace. There is no modicum of logic in saying that Spain and popery controlled the minds of men and then praising Bolívar and his offspring for "liberating" the minds of men. Logically, too, only priests who obeyed his injunctions would be allowed to officiate, and thus the dictator would have control of the clergy. From this time forward Bolívar followed his dictatorial principle. Churchmen were to him in two categories: the fiendish subversives who did not submit to his will, and the venerable fathers who subscribed to his campaign.

While Bolívar was ruling Caracas and part of Venezuela with an iron hand the opposing Venezuelans and incoming Spanish troops began to move under General José Tomás Boves. The "war to the death" became a fact. The "bloodthirsty Spaniard's" policy of extermination was met by Bolívar's policy of extermination. Bolívar liquidated opposition and is reported to have had slain over 800 non-conforming prisoners. Barbarity followed barbarity. The story of this primitive warfare and of the suffering people has

³⁴ *Ibid.*, I, 36-37; *Cartas del Libertador*, I, 57-59. Prior to this letter of August 10, 1813, Bolívar had written to the archbishop for a list of all of the religious and secular clergy and the properties held by the Church. This is not translated in *Selected Letters*, but is in *Cartas del Libertador* I, 35, dated August 7, the day Bolívar entered the town, significantly.

often been told, though slanted to the advantage of Bolívar. By June, 1814, Bolívar had to leave Caracas. He made his disastrous march east and suffered two bad defeats. So far had he fallen in prestige that some of his party leaders were for executing him or turning him over to the enemy. He narrowly avoided the fate of Miranda and was permitted to leave his country for the island of Margarita. His character and his lack of training and principles had again failed the test.

(To be concluded)

JEROME V. JACOBSEN

Loyola University, Chicago.

Book Reviews

The Attitudes of the New York Irish Toward State and National Affairs, 1848-1892. By Florence E. Gibson. Columbia University Press, New York, 1951. Pp. 480.

Studies of the immigrant in American history were long in the hands of filiopietists more interested in eulogizing than in understanding their forbears. Recent historians, focusing attention upon the immigrant group in its dynamic relations with other cultural groups, have had greater success in comprehending the influence of the immigrant upon America's development. Doctor Gibson in this study rejects the partisan enthusiasm of the former without achieving the insight of the latter.

In 1850 the Irish were roughly twenty-six percent of New York City's population. Though this figure was halved by 1890, the census of that year showed that twenty-eight percent of the City's population were by then of Irish parentage. According to the author, the Irish were very early interested in politics, and were "clannish" and "opinionated" as well, so that they were of considerable influence in New York political life in the latter half of the nineteenth century. How they used their influence is the burden of the book.

The study shows that the anglophobia characteristic of the Irish was exploited by politicians, native and Irish, degrading political life, fostering ugly growths like the Tweed Ring, and oftentimes embarrassing American foreign relations as in the days of the Fenians, the Land League and the National League. In such an interpretation, of course, there is nothing new. Except for the excellent discussion of the extradition controversy of the 1880's, her treatment of events from the Know-Nothing movement to the election of 1892 is commonplace. The value of the book lies in the detailed narrative it offers of over half a century of Irish-American participation in New York politics.

The account is based mainly upon newspapers; yet this presents a problem. Although Irish-American newspapers, like the immigrant press in general, depended for existence upon successful reflection of immigrant opinion, probably the Irish vote was determined less by them than by the structure and associations of ward politics. When discussing elections, it would have been helpful if the author had furnished a breakdown of the vote by wards to determine whether or not Irish electoral action correlated with Irish editorial opinion.

Several times the author states that she is concerned simply with presenting Irish-American political attitudes, disclaiming responsibility for any analysis of their origin. In this reviewer's opinion, however, the attitudes are meaningless without an understanding of the community where they were generated. For example, the proliferation of factions in the 1880's, so confusing to the reader of this book, remains obscure unless one understands the deep fissure that Henry George cut through Irish-American life beginning

in 1881 when Patrick Ford sent him to Ireland as correspondent for the *Irish World*.

All this is not to say that Doctor Gibson is unfair. She appreciates the part played by the Irish in the Civil War, and goes to great lengths to exonerate Patrick Egan of blame for the bad relations that developed with Chili during his sojourn there as American Minister in the early 1890's. But the limitations she has imposed upon her study make it impossible to portray sympathetically the Irish-American predicament. Economically depressed and socially rejected, the Irish expressed their bitterness irrelevantly in a passionate and belligerent nationalism that had already passed the peak of intensity in the years that make up the closing chapters of this book. If sometimes the Irish were a burden to America that was the price that the nation was obviously willing to pay for their labor and loyalty.

THOMAS N. BROWN

University of Notre Dame

The Life of Sebastián Lerdo de Tejada, 1823-1889. A Study of Influence and Obscurity. By Frank Averill Knapp, Jr. The University of Texas, Latin-American Studies, XII. The University of Texas Press, Austin, 1951. Pp. ix-292. \$4.00.

There were two Lerdos in the maelstrom of Mexican politics of the last century, this one and his brother Miguel. Their names are associated with the anti-clerical laws of 1857 and 1874. Miguel went into seclusion when he disagreed with Juárez, and he died of typhus fever in 1861. Sebastián, who hardly knew his brother, then got into the Juárez following, stayed with Benito while the French occupied Mexico, returned with him, and on his death in 1872 took over the presidency. After four years Lerdo attempted a second term but was forced out by Díaz. He escaped to New York, where he lived a recluse for his last thirteen years. Everything about the man, his personality, his motives, his influence, was obscure, and still is, in spite of this noble attempt to get him out of his historical limbo. He is not just overshadowed in fame because his rule was sandwiched between Juárez and Díaz; he simply did nothing to merit any praise from historians, who have generally accepted H. H. Bancroft's condemnation of his regime.

If you do not read carefully the preface of this book you will be tearing your hair before you are out in it many pages. You expect an objective biography, but Dr. Knapp had given up that idea. He evidently had many heartaches in his research trying to find some approach to his enigmatic subject in a welter of political claptrap and opprobrium, and he must be accorded praise for his attempt to clothe a drab, Mexican *politico* in the habiliments of a sage, educator, Solon, and statesman. Only an enthusiastic student would have dug so widely to find so little substantial data about such a biographee, and only one in love with research or the Good Neighbor program would want to live long with this unsociable, stuffy Lerdo.

In this preface Dr. Knapp admits having little "essential source material," and no "intimate keys to Lerdo the man, his habits, ambitions, ideals," no reliable evidence on his motivations, and so he reconstructs Lerdo's life "by necessarily indirect evidence and frequently by implication," producing a "biography" of the scene and people around Lerdo. This most unusual procedure permits numerous interpretations of the actions of Lerdo and a borrowing of a little fame from each of the "great" men of his time. The interpretations are all sympathetic toward Lerdo, critical of Juárez, Díaz, and "acrobatic Historians" who have berated Lerdo. Admitting the mistakes made by his subject, Dr. Knapp explains or palliates them, even putting the actions of Lerdo above the civil and moral code, nowhere more unfortunately than in describing the escape of Lerdo and his followers from Mexico City. "With them were 50,000 pesos extracted from the funds of the federal treasury, which indicated not so much Lerdo's dishonesty as the firm belief in the legality of his position and his probable intent to make a second stand. . . ." (P. 283). The facts are: Lerdo had turned over the government to the Porfiristas when his plan to hold a fraudulent election failed; he had no intention of making a further stand; he had no legal right to any public funds; and H. H. Bancroft (*History of Mexico*, VI, 428) cites authorities for saying that the loot was over \$200,000, plus other treasure carried away on fifty mules and in twenty-five wagons; leastwise Sebastián was able to live without work or worry in comfortable, almost luxurious seclusion in New York for thirteen years.

Really, there seems to have been no controversy about Lerdo's place among the semi-competent politicians of Mexico until this book brought it up. The author by making general and particular assumptions has put together a total effigy which might or might not resemble the original. The general assumptions cannot be granted without some substantiation, namely, that Lerdo was a great "statesman," with "vast knowledge" and an "incisive intellect" and that his brother and other "liberals" (not conservatives) were "brilliant." It just cannot be assumed that Lerdo may have been the brains behind Juárez and may have been "the real intellectual, moral, and nationalistic force behind his ultimate determination" to execute Maximilian. The idea that Lerdo was swept into the presidential chair by a large popular majority becomes misleading unless it is explained that he received 9,520 votes to 150, in total about the number of men in the army, and far less than one per centum of the population. No one has yet proved that the constitution of 1857, or Lerdo's application of it in 1874, has done anything to advance democracy in Mexico; nor can one assume that its fashioning was a flash of genius, since the pattern had been set and followed in many places for over half a century. Worst of all is the assumption that an official publication, the mouthpiece of a party, tells the truth. One of the examples of gullibility in this respect appears on page 222: "The administration of Sebastián Lerdo was probably the most tolerant and liberal régime Mexico had ever known, because Lerdo placed individual guarantees . . ." et cetera; the footnote to this laudatory paragraph reads: "It was significant that Lerdo liked to style his own régime 'the tolerant, patriotic, and progressive

administration which Señor Lerdo directs. . . . *Diario Oficial*, January 1, 1875."

A brief comment about the Epilogue on Lerdo's place in history where he becomes, without the previously mentioned essential sources, "perhaps the most outstanding example among many, many forgotten statesmen submerged in the patina surrounding Juárez and Díaz." "Lerdo," concludes Dr. Knapp, "lives not in history and he probably never will." This is indeed an odd conclusion. Lerdo has a place in history, a small, obscure place, not such as he or his biographer would wish, but at least the corner in which Bancroft and others have placed him. This book gives the most favorable interpretation possible of his life and actions.

JEROME V. JACOBSEN

Loyola University, Chicago.

Alcuin, Friend of Charlemagne. His World and His Work. By Eleanor Shipley Duckett. The Macmillan Company, New York, 1951. Pp. xii-337. \$5.00.

Miss Duckett needs no introduction to the historian. Her delightful *Gateway to the Middle Ages* and her *Anglo-Saxon Saints and Scholars* have qualified her as historian, research scholar and exquisite story-teller more than any recommendation that I can give. But in *Alcuin* she is even better.

Every schoolboy knows something about Alcuin, and every historian is capable of stating a few facts about his work in the Palace School of Charlemagne. Some may be able to add a few observations about this intriguing Englishman who, following in the footsteps of the great Bede, did so much for European learning in its all-important formative years. But then too often words fail, and Alcuin again becomes the "shadowy figure" of Miss Duckett's preface.

Yet he is scarcely "shadowy" any longer. By her touch he has become a fantastically interesting, indeed exciting person whose life runs from the scholarly work of the schools of York, through the intellectual programs of the monasteries to the courts of popes and kings. For Alcuin was no isolated figure; he was alive with the spirit of his age, in him are expressed its hopes, its visions, its struggles and its adversities. Indeed from the eventful Easter in 781 when he first encountered Charles in Parma to his last breath at Tours where, even as deacon he was abbot, he was the Frankish intellect. He did not as some detached seer contemplate the intellectual foundation of the New Europe; he laid his hand to the cementing of some of its mightiest stones, and one wonders really what Charlemagne would have been without him, for Alcuin was the light of his mind and the strong tower of his faith.

He was a comparatively old man when he became the leader of that coterie of scholars who left their mark on the mind of the new Europe, yet he never lost his "devoted earnestness for the good of this wicked world." Though his own works belie much originality he was nonetheless a man of exceptional scholarly ability (one wonders what he would

have done under a Damascene in the profound intellectual atmosphere of the "theological East"), yet he willingly sacrificed himself to the lusterless rudiments of grammar and to the teaching of frightfully dull Frankish boys. Still, these boys were the hopes of Europe, and as he wrote to the monks at Jarrow, "he who does not learn as a boy, does not teach when he is old."

What vision as a teacher? He had some of that universal mind of the Fathers coupled with the courage and drive of the "new peoples." He developed the Palace Schools; he enlisted the efforts of excellent scholars; he confronted even the "autocratic and dictatorial" Charles, and throughout his letters he is found preaching incessantly and momentous (certainly for the future) doctrine of the unity of the West. He held the doctrine of Christ a sacred trust, and defended it vigorously against the heretic, but he relied not on force but on "reason and truth." He transformed the liturgy of the Frankish church, bringing it into line with the practices of Rome, and it was Alcuin who introduced the *Credo* into the Mass in the North. In an age delineated by extremes of brutality and misguided devotion, he stood forth the apostle of moderation, temperance and solid understanding: "God does not care so much what we eat as He cares how we obey. . ." and "A man can be driven to baptism but not to belief."

Then too, there appears no better guide to an understanding of the political thinking of the age than this untiring teacher. May we not say that without Alcuin the underlying spirit of the Holy Roman Empire is lost, and the Christmas Day crowning in 800 and the statement of Einhard—so variously interpreted—that Charles was "reluctant" to receive the imperial crown cannot be properly evaluated? Miss Duckett avoids any decision on this matter, but the life of Alcuin that she has given us verily shouts the answer. Throughout his long life, the old abbot of Tours had been one of the most ardent defenders of religion and the sanctity of the Holy See, and his spirit permeated the soul of Charlemagne who, for all his titles, always maintained a fine primitive respect for the sanctity of religion. Such a king could not have assumed an honor which associated him so intimately with the cause of the faith without sincere trepidations. Einhard, "the busy ant" and "the serious page" described by Theodulf, may not have known this, but Alcuin and his friend, the great Arno of Salzburg, who was present at the ceremony, certainly did.

Yet why go further? There is so much that is presented in this work as if for the first time: the sketches of Charlemagne himself, the life of the Frankish court, the little vignettes on the scholars. Read the book and come in contact with a world that you do not know. Many have tried in the past to recreate it; they have failed. We have had to wait for Miss Duckett whose genius couples a serious and penetrating scholarship with the touch of the poetess. This is the kind of writing this justifies the role of historian.

JOHN A. KEMP

Loyola University, Chicago

Lewis Cass, the Last Jeffersonian. By Frank B. Woodford. Rutgers University Press, New Brunswick, New Jersey, 1950. Pp. ix, 380. \$5.00.

It seems incredible that such a significant and colorful figure as Lewis Cass should last have been the subject of a biography in 1899. Cass was a national figure of considerable stature in the first half of the nineteenth century. He was for eighteen years territorial governor of Michigan, having received the appointment from President Madison for meritorious service in the War of 1812. He served as Secretary of War in Jackson's cabinet, as ambassador to France for six years, as senator from Michigan from 1845 to 1857, and Secretary of State in Buchanan's cabinet. If his contemporaries had such trust in his ability and if his record was one of honorable achievements, how can we account for the neglect? The sad truth is that he was a Democrat in those years when the Democratic Party was too often the party of expediency and self-seeking. With rare exceptions, the Democratic Party of Polk, Pierce, and Buchanan was a machine party of small men and sectional principles. History has fairly judged it, and in so judging history has cast the mantle of oblivion on some rather praiseworthy men, Cass among them.

Mr. Woodford, fortunately, was led by "inescapable forces" (says the dust jacket) to make the necessary modern evaluation of the architect of the principle of *popular sovereignty*. Through his efforts we are presented with an accurate description of the stage upon which Cass played and of the role in which he was cast. Students of the old Northwest will be grateful for a new perspective from which to examine the growth of Michigan, Indiana, Illinois, and Wisconsin. From Mr. Woodford's evidence it is clear that Cass truly deserves the title of "empire builder." His struggles with the national government for roads and fortifications; his efforts to lure immigrants into the west; his concern for good territorial organization; and his attempts to improve the public land and Indian services were all part of his program of western development. In fact, it might be asserted that Cass contributed more to the development of the upper middle west than any other American, not excluding Horace Greeley!

Cass' career as Secretary of War, starred by such incidents as the Black Hawk War, the Cherokee case, the Nullification imbroglio, and the Ohio-Michigan boundary dispute, brought him into close touch with national problems and the growing dilemmas of sectionalism. It is here that Mr. Woodford is least effective, perhaps because he finds Cass something less than heroic. But, in dealing with Cass in France and the machinations preceding the Webster-Ashburton Treaty, Mr. Woodford rediscovers what Americans knew at the time—that Cass was an ardent (almost jingoistic) defender of the American cause in European diplomatic circles.

With the presidential aspirations and senatorial achievements of General Cass Mr. Woodford deals candidly and fairly. The Oregon question, the Wilmot Proviso, the Mexican War, the Nicholson letter, the election of 1848, Popular Sovereignty, the Compromise of 1850 are passed in review and the reader is amazed at the position occupied by Cass in Congress. Clay, Calhoun, and Webster were not the only great congressmen of that era. And like them, Cass made history—and mistakes.

Why, one asks, when he has completed the volume, was Cass the "last Jeffersonian?" The author neither explains Jeffersonianism nor demonstrates Cass' adherence to the Jeffersonian system. What does emerge from the book is the portrait of a politician whose actions followed current exigencies and whose principles were based on the mixed conditions and beliefs of a frontier democracy. Cass was true to the spirit of the west—the spirit of nationalistic manifest destiny coupled with great capitalistic expectations.

MENTOR L. WILLIAMS

Illinois Institute of Technology

Notes and Comments

The Education of the Mexican Nation, by George K. Kneller, was published this year by Columbia University Press. The book is not intended to be a history of education in Mexico but an analysis of the educational trends and progress in the light of the needs of the people. After the first two chapters of background materials the work becomes an historical record of the present status of the educational system as administered by the Mexican government. The work should be noted in historical periodicals because it is in the main a painstaking study and interpretation of the ideals, aims, training programs, curricula, methods, problems and frustrations of the recent ministries of education. The study is sympathetic and objective, bringing together a reference bibliography of wide breadth, and moreover is on the encouraging more than patronizing side. The summaries concluding the chapters and the final assessment of the results of six years of investigation will be duly appreciated by general readers. The general conclusion in view of the centuries-old illiteracy of the populace and the functional deficiencies of both educators and educables, is that Mexico has made great strides toward elevating her people socially, economically, and politically, though there is much yet to be done to bring about a mature, national existence based upon training in the little red schoolhouses.

From the critical and historical viewpoint there are some grounds for quarrel. Criticism will be made of statements in the introductory chapters, as is customary, rather than on the findings in the body of the work, which is almost strictly in the department of education. In the first fifty pages there are misleading generalizations and some poorly authenticated conclusions. "Resentful of abuse from exploiting overlords, who have too often betrayed and frustrated them, Mexico's peoples are driving toward fuller individual recognition and more active citizenship," (p. 3) is open to query, if one realizes that no immediate "overlord" for the past fifty years at least has been able to exist without the approval of the government overlords. "Communities maintain the right to appropriate land needed for their subsistence, even if it has to be taken from large private properties," (p. 6) likewise needs qualification, for no community can take land from one of the stout politicians; moreover, the statement is typical com-

munistic bombast. Following this passage is another rather naïve statement about the "redistribution" of land during Cárdenas's administration. Your reviewer happened to have been present during the process of such "redistributions,"—confiscations of properties of non-party, or non-communist, citizens and foreigners. In an effort to give all opinions on the many moot topics Dr. Kneller shows too much deference to the printed page, to official sources and to biased or very secondary writers. Much more could be said about the "cultural missions" and "rural schools" (p. 47) which in the Calles-Cárdenas periods served the purpose of educating children in atheism, communism, and hate of the United States. While Dr. Kneller is correct in thinking that the Mexican peoples should be directed in their aspirations for education, it is still not clear who should do the telling and how far the people enjoy any right to get what they want.

Again in the preliminary pages there are errors. It is several times stated that Mexico became independent in 1810; Hidalgo is given credit for "severing relations" with Spain, (p. 34); Fray Pedro de Gante is called Father instead of Brother; in the sentence "Maximilian and the invading French had been driven out in 1862 only by means of unified national effort," (p. 36), there are three mistakes. A sample of several far-fetched conclusions appears on page 10, where, because there have been established an Institute of Linguistic Research and a model village, the conclusion is: "Education in Mexico is thus becoming Indian-conscious." Despite these deficiencies the meat of the book, the last 200 pages cannot be ignored as a contribution to knowledge of education in our neighboring nation. The summary criticism at the end is very satisfactory.

J. V. J.

* * * *

Nearly everyone acquainted with the work of the Jesuits in the old and the new world knows of the distinguished contribution made by the Sodality of the Blessed Virgin to the apostolate of lay and clerical rehabilitation during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Yet practically no one, even among those dedicated to the work today, knows the name of its founder. I do not know whether Jean Leunis (1532-1584) would be too happy about this, because the work of the Sodality was his very life, but it is in such wise that he has been treated by history.

Now there is a book to explain the origins of this world-wide institution. It is *Le Père Jean Leunis, S.J. (1532-1584): Fondateur des Congrégations mariales*, by J. Wicki, S. J., translated from the German by T. Wey and P. Defoux. (Institutum Historicum S.J., Rome, 1951. Pp. xxi-138.) This excellent piece of scholarly research is an effort to restore to him his place in the story of a great spiritual work.

Jean Leunis was a French-speaking Belgian of Liège and was intimately associated with some of the great names in the Jesuit Order. He arrived in Rome to enter the Order with his only worldly possession, the *Office of the Blessed Virgin*; he was received by Saint Ignatius himself, had his examination from the noted secretary of the Jesuits, Polanco, and received his novitiate training under Corneille Wischaven, the first novice-master of the Society. His training was most haphazard; he had no formal novitiate, his studies he performed by himself, and after but six years with the Jesuits he was ordained in Rome in 1562.

His life saw him in Rome, Paris, Belgium, and Montepulciano; his work was the teaching of the lowest grades of the college, but, however humble his academic work, he left a series of Sodalitys of the Blessed Virgin as his great contribution to the re-inspiration of the Catholic youth that was to make the Church so strong at the end of the century. It is of interest to note that the rules of the Sodality were directed towards the establishment of a true Christian humanism in the hearts and minds of the students of the Jesuit colleges. Out of the ranks of this organization came so many vocations to the priesthood and to a holy lay life, that it is almost impossible to describe its wide-spread influence in the work of the Catholic Reformation.

But Leunis' work seems to have met with constant opposition, not merely from great teaching organizations, like the University of Paris, but also from certain Jesuits themselves. In fact, were it not for the constant support given him by the General, Everard Mercurian, the movement would have failed at the outset.

Leunis himself ended his rather brief life in northern Italy. After a ridiculous "iron and blood" attempt to convert the Vaudois heretics, it was finally seen that much more could be done to win over these people through peaceful preaching of the Gospel and through a work of solid Christian charity. Therefore Leunis and some other Jesuits were sent into the Val Perosa and labored there with signal success. Not long after, however, he was sent

to the Jesuit college in Turin where he again devoted himself to sodality work and where he died November 19, 1584. "Il ne pensait et ne vivait que pour la Congregation."

Father Wicki and his translators have added a precious page to the history of the Sodality of the Blessed Virgin. They have drawn on the most excellent primary and secondary sources; their work is an excellent piece of research. There is only one criticism: in their passion for solid and objective scholarship, they have almost forgotten Jean himself, and one has the feeling that even after reading the work the reader does not know too much about him. Certain questions could have been treated in more details, especially, the position of the Sodality, as a corporation (legally it was a gild), and its original democratic character, which was lost under the Jesuit General Aquaviva, and its methods of operation in its various locales. But this criticism is more of the "how-I-would-write-the-book" variety, and the authors undoubtedly believed that these questions were treated in more general works.

J. A. K.

* * * *

The Newberry Library Bulletin, Second Series, No. 6 (May, 1951), has a fine and well merited tribute to William B. Greenlee. Inspired in college by Morse Stephens to an interest in the history of Portugal he has gathered over more than fifty years and excellent collection of works and materials on the great Portuguese empire. These he has placed in the Newberry Library in a section known as The William B. Greenlee Collection. It is recognized as the best collection in the United States on Portugal to 1820. Its founder has already been widely honored by learned societies of three continents and has received from the Portuguese government the rank of Commander of the Order of St. Iago for his scholarly contributions. His name will be held in grateful blessing by those who will share the fruits of his collecting hobby. On the occasion of the public display of special items of the collection Professor C. R. Boxer delivered an address describing the collection, which is published in this number of the *Bulletin* and is available at the Newberry Library.

* * * *

"Education in Colonial Louisiana," by Stuart G. Noble and Arthur Nuhrah, appears in the October, 1949, *The Louisiana His-*

torical Quarterly, which has only recently come from the press. The co-authors have been gathering materials on their chosen area for some time and now present a "somewhat more accurate and comprehensive account of the schools of this period than was heretofore possible." By a very peculiar oversight there is no mention made of *The French Jesuits in Lower Louisiana (1700-1763)*, the valuable study by Jean Delanglez, published in 1935. Not only would this work amplify the general account just written, but it would offer a fine guide to materials on education in Louisiana and the problems of establishing schools in the colony.

* * * *

"A Concise History of the University of Texas, 1883-1950," by W. J. Battle, appears in the April, 1951, *Southwestern Historical Quarterly*. The paper is indeed too concise to bring forth much except the most notable features of the development of the great University of Texas. Ernest C. Shearer has an interesting article on "The Callahan Expedition, 1855," from Georgia, and Donald W. Peters brings out some fine points of "The Rio Grande Boundary Dispute in American Diplomacy," illustrating his findings by colored maps. The remainder of the number is devoted to "General John Lapham Bullis, the Thunderbolt of the Texas Frontier," and documents on "Moses Lapham."

* * * *

"Your Truly Attached Friend, Mary Lincoln," finds its proper place in the *Journal of the Illinois State Historical Society*, the Spring Number of this year. Charles V. Darrin edits ten letters of Mrs. Abraham Lincoln that have never been published, all addressed to Mrs. John Henry Shearer. Norman W. Caldwell writes an article of general interest in the same number: "Fort Massac: Since 1805."

Professor Thomas D. Clark takes us back to the days of an old American institution in his study of "The Country Store in American Social History," which was delivered as an address at the Ohio State Museum and is now published in the April, 1951, *Ohio State Archeological and Historical Quarterly*. The colorful description brings out the point that the store tended to centralize all community life in the rural areas.

* * * *

"Canada is a North American nation . . . independent, a fully self-governing North American nation." So writes Professor Walter N. Sage of the University of British Columbia in the *Pacific Historical Review* for May, 1951. Professor Sage explains his reasons for his position as stated and moreover reveals Canadian friendship for the United States. His address of last December to the Pacific Coast Branch of the American Historical Association is entitled: "Canada: The Neighbor to the North." In the same number Professor John J. Johnson discusses "Foreign Factors in Dictatorship in Latin America." He presents a number of reasons for his conclusion that the democratic processes in Latin America have been and are almost nil.

* * * *

Verbum, a scholarly quarterly published by the Catholic University of Rio de Janeiro has a very remarkable article by Max H. Boudin, which amounts to an eighty page grammar and vocabulary of the Timbira group of Indians along the Gurupi River in northern Brazil, whose chief is the last of the formerly greater tribe of Kré-Yé Indians. The study is phonetic and the words are translated into Portuguese. This magazine also carries an annual bibliography of historical works on Brazil, arranged by Helio Vianna.

* * * *

Michigan History has rendered another service to historians and economists by publishing a translation of Karl Neidhard's "Reise nach Michigan . . . im Sommer 1934," which appeared in the first and only issue of *Amerikanisches Magazin* of May, 1835. Only two copies of the German are known to exist. The article is translated by Frank X. Braun and edited with an introduction by Robert Benaway Brown in the March, 1951, number of *Michigan History*. On both front and back covers The Michigan Historical Commission and the Historical Society of Michigan express their congratulations to the City of Detroit on its 250th birthday.